



X-18419
UCSB LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. III.

List of Contributors to Volume III.

- REV. EDWIN A. ABBOTT, D.D.
REV. PROF. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
LIC. CARL CLEMEN, PH.D.
F. C. CONYBEARE, M.A.
REV. JOHN A. CROSS, M.A.
THE LATE REV. R. W. DALE, D.D., LL.D.
REV. JAMES DENNEY, D.D.
REV. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
REV. JOSEPH EDKINS, D.D.
RIGHT REV. CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, D.D., D.C.L.
VERY REV. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.
REV. PROF. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.
REV. HUGH MACMILLAN, D.D., LL.D.
PROF. W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.
REV. H. A. REDPATH, D.D.
REV. PROF. A. ROBERTS, D.D.
REV. PROF. W. SANDAY, D.D.
REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D.
REV. JOHN WATSON, D.D.
REV. PRER. B. WHITEFOORD, B.D.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.
W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FIFTH SERIES.

Volume III.

London :
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCVI.

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

THE TOWER OF BABEL.

GEN. XI. 1-9.

I.

IN the chapter which precedes this story of the Tower of Babel, there is an account of the origin of all the nations known to the early Jewish people. The descent of the various races which occupied Central Asia, Asia Minor, Egypt, and the neighbouring countries in Africa, Cyprus, and the continent of Eastern Europe, is traced out from Noah, and his three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japhet. The chapter is not a genealogical table—an account of the line of descent of individuals; it is an account of the origin and growth of different races. The names are the names, not of men, but of tribes and nations. This is apparent in many parts of the chapter even to unlearned readers. For instance, in chapter x., verse 15—"Canaan begat Zidon his firstborn, and Heth"—these might be the names of persons. But then follows a succession of names which we all recognise as belonging to races: "the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgashite, and the Hivite, and the Arkite," and so on. Scholars have recognised, even in the names which might seem to be the names of men, tribal and national names.

There is, however, one conspicuous exception. The interest of the early Jewish people in the great empire of Babylon was so great that a special account is given of Nimrod, its founder, and of the growth of his power.

But, taken as a whole, the chapter contains, not the genealogy of individuals, but the genealogy of the various races which occupied all those parts of the world that were

known to the early ancestors of the Jewish race ; and the chapter closes with these words : "These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations : and of these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood."

The chapter, dry and uninteresting as it must be to many of us, has a great interest for men who are learned in the early history of mankind. It is full of difficulties,—partly because most of the countries to which it relates have been occupied during the last 4,000 years by a succession of races drifting towards the West. From Central Asia, where this story places the origin of the great migration which peopled the countries known to the ancient Jews, there have been successive movements, sometimes of a few families together, sometimes of whole tribes and nations, to take possession of the fair countries of Europe. Wave after wave of population has rolled over Asia Minor, and then over Bulgaria and the other countries lying between the Black Sea and the Atlantic. As these movements have gone on, tribe has blended with tribe, and nation with nation. In the absence of definite and trustworthy accounts of the races which occupied some of these countries in early times, it has, therefore, become extremely difficult to identify with any confidence many of the names preserved by this ancient chronicle. Ethnology, however, is a science which as yet is in its infancy. In the course of a hundred years or so, the narrative, even in its obscurer parts, may become as intelligible to all of us as it was to the people for whom it was first written. It was plain enough once : it will, perhaps, become plain again.

There are scholars who affirm that some of the statements in this chapter which seemed most perplexing, and which, to our earlier knowledge seemed inaccurate, are being confirmed by recent investigations. I am not anxious to seize testimony of this kind. The nervous

eagerness with which some Christian men clutch at every confirmation of the accuracy of the Scriptures occurring among the results of modern historical and scientific inquiry is unworthy of the calm and immovable faith in the spiritual substance of divine revelation which is necessary to the strength and joy of the Christian Church.

But why did the editor of the Book of Genesis insert this account of the origin of the nations known to the Jews? What was the use of it in relation to those great religious truths and laws which were intended to give inspiration and form to their national life? That is an interesting question. As far as we are concerned, the chapter seems, at present at least, of very little use. It cannot be of much use, since we are uncertain about the meaning of many parts of it. One of its great uses for the moment appears to be to remind us that, if we have discovered a great many things in recent centuries, we have also forgotten a great many.

But this book was not written yesterday: if it had been, it would, I suppose, have contained only those things that would have been of immediate religious service to ourselves or our contemporaries. It was written some 4,000 years ago: it preserves documents belonging to a still more remote time—documents intelligible then though unintelligible now. And this account of the origin of the nations with which the Jews had to do—the Assyrians, the Medes, the Persians, the people of Egypt, of Abyssinia, the Ionians, the nations that occupied Canaan before the Jews took it, and that still held the wild part of the sea-board even in the days of David and Solomon—this account, I say, of the nations with which the Jews had to do was of great moral and religious value.

When preaching on the first chapter of this book, I pointed out the grandeur of the religious ideas of which it is the expression. To the great nations which surrounded

the Jewish people the universe was full of mighty gods. The light was the creation of one God, and the darkness of another; if, indeed, light and darkness were not themselves divine powers. In the glorious Psalm of Creation, the Jew was taught that God—the God who had revealed Himself to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, and whose earthly home was in the tabernacle and the temple—said: “Let there be light: and there was light. And God divided the light from the darkness.” To surrounding nations, sun, moon, and stars were the separate creations and thrones of separate divinities: the Jew was taught that God created them all. The earth had its god, and the sea, the harvest, and the vintage. The Jew was taught on the first page of his sacred books, and he sang it in the noblest of the later psalms, that one God reigned over all. “In His hand are the deep places of the earth; the heights of the mountains are His also; the sea is His, and He made it, and His hands formed the dry land.” “Fire, and hail; snow, and vapour; stormy wind fulfilling His word; fruitful trees, and all cedars; creeping things, and flying fowl,” are all invoked to praise the one God. “For He commanded, and they were created; His name alone is exalted. His glory is above the earth and heaven.” M. Comte insisted that monotheism was the result of the discovery that the same great natural laws bind into one system the whole of the material universe. But the Jews were monotheists long before science had made this great discovery, and of this obvious fact he found it hard to give any satisfactory explanation. They did not rest the unity of the Creator on the unity of the creature; for them the whole creation was one because there was but one God.

But the differences that separated different races of men from each other appeared to raise a difficulty in the way of monotheistic faith. Some races claimed descent from the gods they worshipped; others supposed that they had

sprung, they knew not how, from the soil of their native country. How different they were in their colour, in their physical conformation, in their customs and civilisation, and above all in their language! Had they not been created by different divinities? Had they not different origins? So far as the nations were concerned with which the Jews had to do, this tenth chapter of Genesis, with its account of the nations that sprang from the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japhet, was an answer to such questions. These different races—the black races of Africa, the fair Ionians, the Assyrians, the Medes, the tribes of Canaan, had all descended from Noah; and Noah belonged to the race in which God had blended the dust of the earth with His own wonderful life. The universe had one Creator; the human race had one Creator; the kings of the earth and all people, princes and all judges of the earth, whatever descent they might claim from the divinities of their national worship, were created by the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and therefore the Jew called the whole of the human race to worship God. “Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, *all ye lands*”—not merely India, but Egypt and Assyria, and all the lands of the heathen—“serve the Lord with gladness; come before His presence with singing”; “Know ye that the Lord He is God”; “It is He that hath made us, and we are His”—all people and nations and tongues—“we are His people and the sheep of His pasture.”

Yes,—and if they had one Creator, and had descended from the same common ancestors, and had the same blood in their veins, they were all brethren; and it was no wonder that in electing Abraham and his descendants to special dignity and duty, it was God’s design that “all the families of the earth should be blessed.”

These are some of the moral and religious truths which the Jews were taught by this dry account of Gomer, and

Magog, and Madai, and Mizraim, and the rest of the families and nations that came from Noah.

II.

And now, passing from the tenth to the eleventh chapter, and coming to the story of the Tower of Babel, we find that we have really gone back to an earlier time. In the tenth chapter we see a great part of the world—all that part of it known to the early Jews—in the possession of different nations, some of them already great and famous. But at the beginning of the eleventh chapter we find the early families of mankind still living together, journeying East, or rather, as the margin reads, “journeying in the East”; they have not yet come to the coast of Asia Minor, much less into Europe and Africa. The nations are not yet separated from each other; and as yet there is only one language. In this chapter we are therefore to have an account of how these divisions among the one race originated, which have been already described.

There is a great contrast between the two chapters in one very important respect. In the tenth chapter the migrations of the descendants of Noah are narrated in a prosaic way, without any hint that God had anything to do with their division into separate nations with separate languages. The movement westward might have begun at the impulse of a spirit of adventure; or it might have been prompted by the necessity of finding fresh pastures for the cattle of a growing population, or by the hope of finding a more fertile soil for the simple products of early agriculture. The tenth chapter is commonplace history; the eleventh is something very different.

How did it happen that the unity of the race was broken up? Whence came the difference of national language? A reply to these questions is given in the story of the Tower of Babel; and the reply is an ethical and religious one.

There was a serious attempt to hold men together. As the descendants of Noah wandered across the plains of central Asia, they came to the land of Shinar. It was fertile, and gave pasture for their flocks and herds. And it occurred to them that instead of living in tents they might build houses for themselves, and make a permanent home. The writer of the story was accustomed to see houses built of stone; but these early builders had bricks for stone, and for mortar they had slime or bitumen. They resolved to found what would seem to them a great city and a powerful state—a city which was to be the centre of all their wanderings; for as yet they would still have to travel far to find pasture for their cattle. If, however, they built a city where the elders of their tribes might always live to administer law, and where perhaps their women and children might also live in ease, this would keep them from being broken up into separate communities. And in the city they resolved to erect a lofty tower which could be seen from a great distance and the sight of which would be welcome to them as they came home from their wanderings. It was a very natural project, and might have been a harmless one, but there was in it an ambitious temper: they meant to become famous as the creators of a city and a state. Had their only motive been the mutual affection which made them wish to remain together, and so contribute, by mutual services, to the comfort and happiness of the common life, the issue might have been different. But this great project for founding a city after the great catastrophe of the Flood was an ambitious one. There were traditions, no doubt, of the wealth and luxury, and the power of earlier races which had disappeared; and these shepherds and herdsmen determined that they too would do something that would give them enduring glory. This was not the true spirit in which to work. Cities and states should be founded and maintained, not for the glory of their founders and rulers, but

for the well-being of their citizens. The project must be arrested by Divine interference.

The Babylonian legend of Babel, found in the famous library of bricks, appears to attribute the anger of the gods with the builders of Babel to the same cause. The text is indeed very defective; it appears only in broken words; but it seems to declare that the building was stopped because the Divine anger was provoked by the presumption of the builders.

The story is told in Genesis in a highly picturesque form, and not without a distinct touch of irony. You see at once that the writer is telling it in a way to strike the imagination of men: indeed it was the imagination that formed the chief expression for the highest truths in those early times to which this story belongs. "And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the Lord said, Behold, they are one people, and they have all one language; and this is what they begin to do: and now nothing will be withholden from them, which they purpose to do." Their scheme was to hold together and to become a powerful state: and God is represented as saying: "Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech." This would destroy all their hopes. And how did God confound their speech? I believe that the answer lies under the eighth verse: "So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city." Some dissension broke out among the builders; or they quarrelled about their work or their policy; or one of their leaders assumed an authority which the rest resented. Any one of a score of accidents might have caused fierce strife and compelled the abandonment of the enterprise. And the quarrel, after the Hebrew method, is ascribed to God: it was His work; He so controlled and directed the passions

of men that they broke out into open and violent disorder, and so they were scattered abroad. In this way the end of God was accomplished: separated from each other, the common language they had spoken was modified, in one way among one tribe, in another way among another, till at last the earth was filled with different tongues.

Remembering the idiom of the early literature and its characteristic manner, that seems to me the natural meaning of the story. Look at it again: "Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another's speech. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city." That was the way in which He did it. It does not say that He confounded their language and in this way scattered them abroad. But after stating His purpose to confound their language, it goes on at once to say: "So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city." It is true that the account of the Divine purpose reads: "Let us *there* confound their language," and that in the summing up of the story it says: "The Lord did *there* confound the language of all the earth"; but this is nothing more than a vigorous rhetorical figure: what God did at Babel resulted in the rise of different languages—was intended to result in it—and so it was *there* that He confounded "the language of all the earth."

Let me give you a parallel expression which is possible to us even in our more elaborate and prosaic tongue.

More than two hundred and fifty years ago, near the village of Scrooby, on the borders of Yorkshire, Nottingham, and Lincoln, there was founded a Congregational Church which had a wonderful history. The members were driven over to Holland by fierce persecution; they remained for many years in Leyden; half of them crossed the Atlantic in the *Mayflower* and founded the colony of New Plymouth.

The same principles of freedom which governed them in their Church life were acknowledged in the civil policy of the colony ; they founded a colony in which all the colonists had equal rights and an equal share in the government. From New Plymouth free institutions spread over all the great territory of the United States.

If I were speaking of how it came to pass that at a time when England was suffering under the tyranny of James, of Charles, of Wentworth, and of Laud, the English settlements in North America were the home of the principles which have given a free constitution to the great republic of America, I might say : God gave freedom to America when He moved the hearts of Brewster, Smyth, and Robinson to found the Church at Scrooby. It was there, in Brewster's house, where that Congregational Church met for worship, that the foundations of the American Republic were laid. It was there that God gave to the fifty millions of people who now inhabit the magnificent territory between the Atlantic and the Pacific the unrestricted political liberty which has made them the envy of the nations of Europe.

That would be very legitimate rhetoric ; and in the early literature nothing was more natural than to describe God as doing at Babel what resulted, and inevitably resulted, from what He did there. He confounded the languages of the earth there, because it was there that by His providence He broke up the race into different nations.

I had come to the conclusion that this was the meaning of the story long before I saw the fragments of the Babylonian legend in Professor Sayce's edition of Dr. Smith's *Chaldean Genesis*. And what seemed to me the meaning of the story in Genesis also seems to be the meaning of the legend. It reads :—

“To confound their speeches—He set His face :
He gave the command—He made strange their counsel.”

That seems to say that the confusion of tongues which was the Divine purpose was brought about by the hostility that arose in their counsels.

I repeat that, in my judgment, what happened was this—divisions among the builders of the city made it impossible for them to carry on their work; they separated from each other, settled in different countries, and so came to form different nations with different languages.

And all this was the result of a Divine purpose. The spirit in which these ancient tribes of men resolved to hold together made it expedient in the interest of the human race that their project should be defeated, and that instead of founding one great community under the same government and the same laws, they should be broken up and become the founders of separate nations.

III.

The wars, the mutual jealousies, the innumerable inconveniences which come from the existence of independent states have sometimes led great men to desire that all national distinctions should be broken down; but the nation, like the family, is a Divine institution, and has a great place in the development of the life of man. The different manners, the different traditions, the different political and social institutions of different nations, have contributed to a richer and more varied development even of the intellectual power of the race and of its moral character. Englishman and Frenchman, German and Spaniard, Italian and Russian, represent distinct types of intellectual and of moral life. The language of each nation—to say nothing of other national distinctions—transmits from century to century the intellectual and moral judgments and the results of the emotional and imaginative activity of the people. It is not only in schools and universities, by lectures and books, that the mind and conscience of a

nation are formed ; its very language, the language of the home and the market-place, is a discipline by which unconsciously to itself every child, as soon as it begins to speak, receives a definite education ; and the differences between languages impress themselves on the national life and conduct. We know that if the whole world had had the same soil and the same climate, the same winds, the same amount of rain and moisture, there would have been infinitely less variety in its products. Fruits and flowers and trees differ in different zones ; animals which cannot live under some skies multiply and become strong under others. The variety of the conditions of physical life gives us an infinite variety in the forms of physical life itself. And the variety of intellectual and moral conditions arising from the existence of separate and independent nations give a corresponding variety to the intellectual and moral life of man. Something is due to race ; but a great deal is due to political and social institutions.

The various types of national character have now become too precise and definite wholly to disappear, whatever may be the future fortunes of mankind ; and I suppose that they will render possible in the crowning ages of the world a glorious variety of types of Christian perfection. The Divine word—the seed of all righteousness—is taking root in many soils ; the good ground is not all of the same sort, and the growth will vary with the soil. It will not be English Puritanism, grand and noble as English Puritanism was in its more vigorous years, that will appear in China when China is penetrated by the spirit of Christ ; and the perfection of a Chinese saint will differ greatly from the perfection of a saintly Hindoo. Persia will contribute one wonderful form of Christian character, Egypt another ; Italy will retain its brilliance and grace in the supernatural life as well as in the natural ; Germany its mysticism and its scholarly strength. The western nations will have their characteristic

virtues transfigured and glorified; the eastern will have theirs; and Russia, with its passion and strength, its mysticism and its vigour, will perhaps mediate between them. The national differences which have enriched the civilisation of the world will also enrich its devotion, its righteousness, and its faith.

The nation as well as the family is a Divine institution. It rests on no voluntary contract between its citizens themselves, or between its citizens and their rulers; it is part of the order of the world, and is intended to contribute to the perfection of human life. This should control and inspire all our schemes for improving the laws and administration of our country. We are separate parts of a great organism, and our supreme care should be for the good, not of a part, but of the whole. To secure the material prosperity of the whole community and of every class in it, to contribute to the intellectual development, not of a class, but of the state; to promote mutual trust and the spirit of brotherhood among the whole people—this should be the end of every Christian politician.

Nor can any man, without a grave neglect of duty, refuse to do his part towards promoting the general welfare of the state. In the family it is not a matter of choice whether parents and children, brothers and sisters, shall care for each other: we have our place in the family by the Divine will, and the obligations of our place are of Divine appointment; for the family is a Divine institution.

In the nation it is not a matter of choice whether the rich shall care for the poor, and the poor for the rich, and all men for each other: we have our places in the nation by the Divine will, and the obligations of our place are of Divine appointment; for the nation as well as the family is a Divine institution. We are politicians because we are Christians.

In our dealings with foreign states it is equally necessary

to remember that nations are Divine institutions intended for the general benefit of the whole human race. We can have no national enemies: by the laws of nature and of God all nations are friends. The spirit that should govern the foreign policy of nations is not a spirit of rivalry, much less of mutual suspicion and hatred, but of co-operation. Germany is necessary to England, and Russia to both. Destroy any race or any nation that has not given itself over simply to the devil, and the whole world will be the poorer. The industries of the different nations of the world in the eye of a Christian politician are but separate shops in one great factory, and the work of every shop is necessary to the success of the common enterprise. The intellectual activities of the different nations are but the different colleges in one great university; and the genius, the learning, the methods, of every college contribute to the intellectual wealth and vigour and glory of all the rest.

Not yet can this fair ideal be realised. But it is at this we are aiming. Through storm and darkness, driven by rough winds, tossed by rough waves, sometimes doubtful of our course, sometimes sure that we have lost it, with our very compass sometimes untrue, and sun and star hidden by dense fogs, the race is making its long voyage across the ocean of human history; but we shall make port at last. The great prayer will some day be fulfilled: "Thy will be done on earth even as it is done in heaven"; and it is the will of God that men should all be brethren and nations all be friends,—that enmity, strife, and suspicion should cease, and that the separate kingdoms of the world in their joy, prosperity, and mutual trust should be like the separate mansions in the House of our Father in heaven.

R. W. DALE.

JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

I. THE PROPHETIC PICTURE OF MATTHEW.

THE three first Gospels present essentially the same view of Jesus as a preacher, a teacher, and the uncompromising foe of Pharisaism. Yet on closer study distinctive features reveal themselves in their respective delineations. In Mark, which may with much probability be regarded as the earliest Gospel, Jesus is presented realistically as a *man*, with marked individuality in experience, speech, manner, and action. In Matthew He is presented as the *Christ*, in His Messianic dignity, yet as a very human, winsome Messiah. In Luke He appears as the *Lord*, the exalted Head of the Church; still a true man, yet bearing the aspect of a saint with an aureole round His head; near us in His grace towards the sinful, yet in some ways wearing a look of remoteness like a distant range of hills softly tinged with blue.

The first Evangelist, as is well known to all readers, loses no opportunity of verifying his thesis: Jesus the Christ. Some of his prophetic citations are unimportant, referring to matters purely external, of no significance for the characterisation of Jesus. An extreme example of this class may be found in the closing words of the second chapter: "He shall be called a Nazarene." Apologists have busied themselves in trying to discover the Old Testament basis of the reference, and some in their despair have had recourse to the hypothesis of some lost book of prophecy whence the quotation was taken. Their labour is well meant but vain. Far better to confess that this is one of the weakest links in the prophetic chain of argument, and try to make an apologetic point of its weakness. That really can be done. It is obvious that no one would ever have thought of a prophetic reference in the instance before us unless the fact had

first been there to put the idea into his mind. If the home of Jesus had not been in Nazareth, who would have dreamt of searching among the Hebrew oracles for a prophetic anticipation? The fact suggested the prophecy, the prophecy did not create the fact. And this remark may apply to many other instances, where we have not, as in this case, independent means of verifying the fact. Sceptics have maintained that not a few of the Gospel incidents were invented to correspond with supposed Messianic prophecies. The truth probably is that in by far the greater number of cases the historical data were there to begin with, stimulating believers in Jesus as the Christ to hunt up Old Testament texts fitting into them as key to lock.

Some of Matthew's quotations reveal delicate tact and fine spiritual insight. Whatever may be their value as proofs that Jesus was the *Christ*, there can be no doubt at all about their value as indications of what the Evangelist thought of *Jesus*. These indications are all the more valuable that they are given unconsciously and without design. The Evangelist's aim in making these citations is to satisfy his first readers that He of whom he wrote was the Great One whose coming all Jews, Christian and non-Christian, expected. But in pursuing this design he lets us see how he conceives the character and ministry of Jesus, and this is really for us now the permanent religious use of these prophetic texts.

Three of these texts stand out from among the group as specially serviceable for this purpose. The first, quoted from Isaiah ix. 1, 2, is introduced in connection with the settlement of Jesus in Capernaum at the commencement of His Galilean ministry. The important part of the quotation lies in the words: "the people which sat in darkness saw a great light."¹ *Jesus of Nazareth, the Light of the dark land of Galilee*—such is the Evangelist's comprehensive concep-

¹ Matt. iv. 16.

tion of the memorable ministry he is about to narrate. On examining his detailed account we perceive that in his view Jesus exercised His illuminating function both by preaching and by teaching: understanding by the former the proclamation to the people at large of the good news of the kingdom as a kingdom of grace, by the latter the initiation of disciples into the more recondite truths of the kingdom. But it is to be noted as characteristic of the first of our canonical Gospels that while the preaching function (*kerygma*) of Jesus is carefully recognised, it is to the teaching function (*didache*) that greatest prominence is given. "Jesus," we are told, "went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom."¹ But beyond such general statements little is said concerning the Preaching. On the other hand, of the Teaching, especially that given to disciples who were indeed its chief recipients, copious samples have been preserved. The "Sermon on the Mount," brought in immediately on the back of the general announcement just quoted, belongs distinctively to the Teaching. However many more might be present, disciples were the proper audience, insomuch that the more appropriate name for the discourse would be, not the *Sermon* on the Mount, but the *Teaching* on the Hill. There Jesus was the light of the few that they might become the light of the world. And He was their light by being their Rabbi. At the close of the discourse the Evangelist makes the comparison between Jesus and the scribes given in Mark in connection with the first appearance of Jesus in the synagogue of Capernaum.² The comparison implies resemblance as well as contrast. Jesus in the view of our Evangelist was a scribe or Rabbi in function, anti-Rabbinical in spirit, and in virtue of both facts the spiritual light of the land. Because He was a Teacher He might be compared with the other religious teachers of the people whose professed aim it was to com-

¹ *Matt.* iv. 23.² *Matt.* vii. 29; *Mark* i. 22.

municate to their countrymen the knowledge of God. Because He differed utterly from these teachers in method and spirit, the light He offered was light indeed. For their light the Evangelist believes to be but darkness, the deepest, most ominous phase of the night that brooded over Galilee and other parts of the Holy Land, as he will take pains to show in the course of his story.

The conception of the Christ as the Light-giver implies that the leading Messianic charism is *wisdom*. But that the author of the first Gospel took no one-sided view of Messianic equipment, but fully recognised the claims of *love*, is shown by the prophetic quotation now to be noticed. It also is taken from the Book of Isaiah, and is in these words: "Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses."¹ In his general preliminary description of the Galilean ministry, Matthew gives a prominent place to a healing function: "healing all manner of sickness and all manner of disease among the people."² The words just quoted from the prophet show us the light in which the healing ministry presented itself to his mind. What struck him most was not the marvellous power displayed therein but the sympathy, the phenomenal compassion. This was not a matter of course; ordinary people did not so view the remarkable cures which were taking place among them. What gained for Jesus fame among them was, beside the benefit received, the preternatural power evinced by His healing acts. Only a deep glimpse into the heart of Jesus could enable any one to see in these acts something more and better than power, and to find in His curative function a fulfilment of the striking Hebrew oracle. Such a glimpse had the Evangelist. He read truly the innermost meaning of the acts, some of which he reports, and so laid his finger on the grand distinction of Jesus. And one who saw the central significance of love in the character of Jesus was not likely to suppose

¹ Matt. viii. 17, from Isa. liii.

² Matt. iv. 23.

that its manifestation was confined to healing acts. He would expect it to reveal itself also in "gracious words" spoken for the healing of sin-sick souls. And though fewer such words are reported in Matthew than we might have desired, there are some that mean much to one who duly considers them.

By far the most important of our three prophetic oracles is the one remaining to be mentioned. It presents, so to speak, a full-length portrait of Jesus, in prophetic language, which will repay detailed study, feature by feature. This citation, like the other two taken from Isaiah, occurs in Matthew xii. 18-21, and is in these terms: ¹

"Behold my servant, whom I have chosen;
My beloved in whom my soul is well pleased:
I will put my Spirit upon Him,
And He shall declare judgment to the Gentiles.
He shall not strive, nor cry aloud;
Neither shall any one hear His voice in the streets.
A bruised reed shall He not break,
And smoking flax shall He not quench,
Till He send forth judgment unto victory,
And in His name shall the Gentiles hope."

The attractive picture is introduced by the Evangelist at this point in his narrative to show the true Jesus in opposition to the Jesus of Pharisaic imagination—a miscreant deserving to die for Sabbath-breaking and other offences against an artificial religious system. He sees in Jesus the realisation of one of the finest ideal conceptions in Hebrew prophecy—the Servant of God, beloved of God, filled with His Spirit, gentle, peaceable, sympathetic, wise, cosmopolitan, capable of winning the confidence and satisfying the aspirations not of Israelites only but of all mankind. It is the retiring non-contentious disposition of Jesus, manifested in connection with a sabbatic conflict, that recalls the prophetic ideal of Messiah to his mind. The

¹ I quote the Revised Version. The original is in Isaiah xlii. 1-4.

baffled foes of Jesus had left the scene of strife in a truculent temper, taking counsel "how they might destroy Him." Perceiving their threatening mood, Jesus withdrew from the place to avoid giving further offence and precipitating a crisis. In this procedure the Evangelist recognises the Messianic trait: "He shall not strive nor cry aloud, neither shall any one hear His voice in the streets." But he is not content to quote this one sentence: he reproduces the passage in full. Instead of a single trait he shows us the complete picture. It is not a case of loose quotation without considering whether the quoted matter be relevant or irrelevant. Of set purpose he brings in this fair portrait of Jesus just here, skilfully using as a foil to set off its beauty the hideously distorted ideas of Him current in the religious world of Judæa. He takes into his hand the sketch of the ancient Hebrew limner, holds it up to his readers, and says: Look on this picture and on that. This is Jesus as I see Him, that is Jesus as Pharisees misconceive Him. Which think you is the true Jesus?

How shall we qualify ourselves for judging what is to be the basis for verification? Must we confine ourselves to the immediate context, or may we roam over the evangelic narrative from its beginning up to this point? I think the Evangelist himself has the whole foregoing story in view, and that that may be the reason why he quotes at length and does not restrict his citation to the one point apposite to the immediate occasion. If so, then we may travel over the preceding pages, that by broad, large observation we may satisfy ourselves that the prophetic delineation answers to the character of Him whose story has thus far been told. The very position of the picture in the book—in the middle, instead of at the commencement—invites us to use the knowledge we have acquired for this purpose. Another Evangelist, Luke, has also presented to his readers an ideal portrait of Jesus, painted in prophetic colours. But his

picture comes in very early, serving as a *frontispiece* to his book.¹ Matthew's picture stands right in the centre, so that we cannot help asking, Is the painting like the original as we now know Him?

Let us then study the goodly image in the light of the history going before. "Behold My servant!"

The first trait is the Divine complacency resting on the person whose character is delineated: "My beloved in whom My soul is well pleased." The detested of the Pharisees is the beloved of God. A strong thing to say; what evidence of its truth? The evangelic historian points in reply to the baptismal scene at the Jordan with the accompanying voice from heaven: "Thou My beloved Son."² This, of course, would have been no evidence for Pharisees who were not there to hear, and who would not have believed on the report of another that the voice had really been spoken; even as there are many now to whom it is no evidence because of their unbelief in the miraculous. For minds of the Pharisaic type no evidence of any sort could avail to show that such an one as Jesus could possibly be the well-beloved of God. Such minds judge men by external tests and by hard and fast rules, with the inevitable result that they often mistake the best for the worst, and the worst for the best, and say of one who is a true servant and son of God: "Thou hast a devil." Happily there is evidence as to the character of Jesus available for all men of open, honest heart, whether they believe in miracle or not. There is the testimony borne by the unsophisticated spiritual instincts of the soul, which can recognise goodness at sight. Can we not see for ourselves, without voices from heaven, that Jesus of Nazareth, as revealed in His recorded words and acts, is a Son of God, if not in the metaphysical sense of theology, at least in the ethical sense of possessing a God-like spirit? Behold My

¹ Luke iv. 16-30.

² Matt. iii. 17.

servant! Yea, a servant indeed: of God, of truth, of righteousness, of *true* truth, of *real* righteousness, with rare capacity for discerning between genuine and counterfeit—a brave, heroic, prophetic Man, fighting for the Divine in an evil time, when godlessness assumed its most repulsive and formidable form under the guise of a showy, plausible, yet hollow zeal for godliness. Truly, in the words of the Hebrew oracle, God had put His Spirit upon Him. The descent of the Spirit at His baptism, if not an objective fact, was at least a happy symbol of the truth.

The second trait in the picture is the retiring disposition of Jesus, described in the words: "He shall not strive nor cry aloud, neither shall any one hear His voice in the streets." Interpreted in the light of the immediate situation these words refer to the peaceable spirit of Jesus evinced by His retirement from the scene of recent conflict to avoid further contention, and the intensification of existing animosities likely to result therefrom. But we may give to this part of the picture a larger scope, and find exemplifications in portions of the evangelic history having no direct connection with Pharisaic antagonism. May not the Evangelist have in view here the ascent to the mountain top and the teaching there given to an inner circle of disciples? The love for retirement among nature's solitudes and for the special work of a master instructing chosen scholars was characteristic of Jesus. He did not indeed shun the crowd or the kind of instruction that tells upon, and is appreciated by, the popular mind. His voice *was* heard in the streets, in the synagogue, from a boat on the lake addressing an immense crowd on the shore. He gave Himself with enthusiasm to evangelism, visiting in succession all the synagogues of Galilee, and never grudging gracious speech to the people wherever they might chance to assemble. Still this was not the work He preferred, nor was He deceived as to its value. "Much seed little fruit"

was His estimate of it in the Parable of *the Sower*. He got weary at times of the crush of crowds, and longed for privacy, and made sundry attempts to escape into solitude. He felt the passion of all deep natures for detachment and isolation—to be alone with God, with oneself, with congenial companions capable of receiving truths which do not lie on the surface.

The retirement to the mountain top was one of these escapes, and the “Sermon on the Mount,” as it has been called, shows us the kind of thoughts Jesus gave utterance to when His audience was not a street crowd, but a band of susceptible more or less prepared hearers. “When He had sat down, His *disciples* came unto Him, and He opened His mouth and taught them.”¹ His first words were the Beatitudes, spoken in tones suited to their import—not shouted after the manner of a street preacher, but uttered gently, quietly, to a few men lying about on the grass, breathing the pure air of the uplands, with eyes upturned towards the blue skies, and with something of heaven’s peace in their hearts. In these sayings of the hill we see Jesus at His best, all that is within Him finding utterance in the form of thoughts concerning citizenship in the kingdom, the righteousness of the kingdom, and the grace of the Divine King and Father, which are very new in emphasis and felicity of expression, if not altogether new in substance. “Why,” we are tempted to ask, “should one capable of saying such things on mountain tops ever go down to the plain below to mingle with the ignorant, stupid mob, not to speak of descending lower still into unwelcome profitless controversy with prejudiced, conceited, malevolent religionists?” But such a question would reveal ignorance of a very important feature in the character of Jesus; viz., that He was not a one-sided man—a mere Rabbi, sage, or philosopher, caring only for intimate fellow-

¹ *Matt.* v. 1, 2.

ship with the select few—but a man who had also a Saviour-heart, with a passion for recovering to God and goodness lost men and women, hungering therefore for contact with the weak, the ignorant, the sinful; making the saving of such His main occupation, and seeking in the companionship of disciples only His recreation.

To this Saviour-aspect of Christ's character the third trait points: "A bruised reed shall He not break, and smoking flax shall He not quench." Broadly interpreted, these words describe the *compassion* of Jesus. The pathetic emblems denote the objects of that compassion: poor, suffering, sorrow-laden, sinful creatures in whom the flame of life temporal or spiritual burnt low, and who in body or soul resembled bruised reeds, frail at the best, rendered frailer still by grief, pain, or moral shortcoming. The pity of Jesus is expressed in negative terms. It is declared that He will not do what many men are prone to do—crush the weak, blow out the flickering flame. The whole truth about Jesus is that He habitually did the opposite with reference to all forms of weakness represented by the bruised reed and the smoking wick. For verification of the statement we have only to look back over the history. Consider *e.g.*, the ministry of healing. Think of the multitudes of sick in Capernaum¹ and elsewhere cured of diseases of all sorts—fever, leprosy, palsy, blindness, insanity. Miracles or not, these are facts as well attested as anything in the Gospels. And the subjects of these healing acts might very appropriately be described as physically or mentally bruised reeds. Take, *e.g.*, the man sick of palsy borne of four—what a wreck physically!² or the demoniac of Gadara—what a sad tragic wreck mentally!³ Of moral wrecks also there is no lack of examples. The palsied man is one; a wreck morally not

¹ Matt. viii. 16, 17.

² Matt. ix. 1-8.

³ Matt. viii. 28-34.

less than physically, a man in whose life vice and disease appear to have been closely intertwined. How then did Jesus treat that man? Did He shun him, or blow out the little flame of goodness that might still be in him, or utterly crush the spirit of hope that was already sorely broken by a hard unfeeling word, or a merciless rebuke? No! He healed the wounded conscience and revived the drooping heart by the gracious word cordially spoken: "Courage, child; thy sins are forgiven." Or look in at that large assembly of "publicans and sinners" in the court of Levi's house in Capernaum.¹ Here is a motley collection of bruised reeds and smoking wicks of all sorts: social outcasts, drunken men, frail women, irreligious, profligate, scandalous people. What is to be done with them? Throw them out into the social refuse heap to rot, or take them out in boats and drown them in the lake? Such may have been the secret thoughts of respectable inhuman people in Capernaum, as such are the thoughts of cynical persons now in reference to similar classes of our modern society. Not such were the thoughts of Jesus. Capable of salvation and worth saving even these, said He. Bruised reeds, yes, but the bruise may be healed; smoking wicks doubtless, but the flame may be made to burn clear. Was He too sanguine? No. How strong the reed may become witness the story of Zacchæus, thoroughly credible, though not told in Matthew;² how bright the dying flame witness the woman in Simon's house with her shower of penitent tears, and her alabaster box of precious ointment.³ "Much forgiven, much love," was the hopeful creed of Jesus. His ideas on this subject were very unconventional. Religious people as He saw them appeared to Him very far from God, and not likely ever to come nigh. On the other hand, those who seemed hopelessly given over to immorality and irre-

¹ *Matt.* ix. 9-13.

² *Luke* xix. 1-10; *vide* especially v. 8.

³ *Luke* vii. 36-50.

ligion He deemed not unlikely subjects for the kingdom. The average modern Christian does not quite understand all this, and perhaps he hopes that Jesus did not altogether mean what He seems plainly to say. But He did mean it, and He acted upon it, and history has justified His belief and policy.

The last trait in our picture is what may be called the cosmopolitanism, or the universalism, of Jesus. "In His name shall the Gentiles hope." That is, He is a Christ not for Jews alone, but for mankind. The Hebrew original, as faithfully rendered in the English Bible, means: "the isles shall wait for His law." The two renderings coincide in sense in so far as they express the universal range of Messiah's functions; they differ only in so far as they point to varying aspects of His work. The one exhibits Him as a universal object of trust, *i.e.*, a universal *Saviour*; the other exhibits Him as a universal *Legislator*: the *Saviour* of the world, the Lord of the world. Now, let it be noted, Jesus could be neither unless He possessed intrinsic fitness for these gigantic tasks. It is not a question of "offices" in the first place, but of character, charisms, endowments. It boots not to tell men that Jesus is Christ, and that as such He exercises the functions of prophet, priest, lawgiver, king, so long as they do not see that He possesses the gifts and the grace necessary for these high functions. He must have it in Him by word, deed, spirit, experience to inspire trust, and to make men look to Him for *law*, *i.e.*, for the moral ideal of life. When men are convinced of His power in these respects, they will accept Him as their Christ; possibly not under that name, for some fastidious disciples may be inclined to discard the title as foreign and antiquated, and unsuited for the vocabulary of a universal and eternal religion. So be it; it matters not about the name (though it will always have its value for theology and the religious history of the

world), the vital matter is what the name signifies. If Jesus can be the spiritual physician, and moral guide of mankind, He is what the people of Israel meant by a Christ, one who satisfies the deepest needs and highest hopes of men. And so the great question is, Can the Jesus of the Gospels do this? The question is not to be settled by authority, or by apologetic evidences based on miracles and prophecies. Trust and moral admiration cannot be produced by such means. Orders to trust are futile, injunctions under pains and penalties to admire vain; proofs that a certain person ought to be trusted and admired inept, unless those to whom the commands and arguments are addressed perceive for themselves in the person commended the qualities that inspire trust and admiration. And if these qualities be there, the best thing one can do for his fellow-men is to let the object of faith and reverence speak for Himself. Hold up the picture and let men look at it. Set it in a good light, hang it well on the wall, remove from the canvas obscuring dust and cobwebs if such there be; then stand aside and let men gaze till the Friend of sinners, the Man of sorrow, the great Teacher, begin to reveal Himself to their souls.

Jesus has so revealed Himself to multitudes in all ages, and of all nationalities; He continues so to reveal Himself to-day. The success or non-success of His self-revelation has no connection with race, but only with moral affinity. Jesus came first to His own people, and for the most part they received Him not. The result condemned not Him but them. They had a veil of religious prejudice on their face, and they could not see Him. It needs an open eye and an open heart to see Jesus truly. The open eye and open heart may be found in any quarter of the globe; sometimes in very unlikely quarters: among barbarians rather than in the great centres of culture and civilisation. The proud, the vain, the greedy, the slaves of fashion,

however religious, know nothing about Jesus. Jesus was always on the outlook for the open eye and simple, open, honest heart, and He was greatly delighted when He found them. The classic example of this quest and delight is the story of the centurion of Capernaum, a Pagan, not a Jew, first-fruit of Gentile faith.¹ What beautiful, sublime simplicity in that Roman soldier's trust! And what a thrill of pleasure it gave Jesus! "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel."

Not in Israel, the very people for whose benefit the Messianic portrait was painted in the olden time. Strange that the same people should produce men capable of such splendid artistic work in the sphere of moral delineation, and be so lacking in the power of appreciating the historical realisation of the prophetic ideals. They devoutly, fanatically believed in the Messiah in the abstract, but could not recognise Him in the concrete. We have to thank Jewish blindness for the unearthing of this ancient prophetic picture by a Christian historian, by way of protest against hideous caricatures of Jesus by His religious contemporaries. We have to thank Jewish unbelief for the tragic result of these deplorable misunderstandings, the crucifixion. Faith in a Pagan soldier, unbelief in the most religious Jews. Faith where you did not look for it, unbelief where faith should have been. As it was then, so it is still, so probably it always will be. All turns on the state of the heart. The pure heart, the unsophisticated conscience, is implicitly Christian everywhere. The men of impure heart, lacking in moral simplicity, may be very Christian in profession, fiercely on the side of Jesus, yet all the while they are really on the side of the Pharisees.

Wisdom, sympathy, modesty, gentleness, wide-heartedness, combined, such is the Evangelist's conception of the

¹ *Matt.* viii. 5-13.

Christ, and of Jesus. Surely a most winsome Jesus and a most acceptable Messiah !

“Behold My servant, whom I uphold,” so runs the oracle in the English version of the Hebrew original. Whom I *uphold*: Jehovah backs His servant, ideal Messianic Israel, however despised, against all comers. So may we Christians feel in reference to our Lord Jesus. We may well uphold Him; we may with good right hold up our heads as believers in Him, as men who support a good cause. Comparative religion teaches nothing to make us ashamed of Him. The only thing we have cause to be ashamed of is our miserably mean, inadequate presentation of Him in theory, and still more in life. Two things are urgently required of us modern Christians: to see Jesus truly and to show Him just as we see Him. “Behold My servant.” Try hard to get a fresh sight of Jesus, to behold Him “with open face.” Then what you have seen show with absolute sincerity, not hiding your light for fear of men who are religious but not Christian. Clear vision, heroic, uncalculating sincerity, how scarce in these days of time-serving! And what power goes with them! Give us a few men whose hearts have been kindled with direct heaven-sent insight into the wisdom and grace of Christ, and who *must* speak what they know and testify what they have seen, and they will bring about a moral revolution, issuing in a Christianised Church and a righteous social state.

A. B. BRUCE.

PROFESSOR SAYCE AND THE HIGHER
CRITICISM.

WHAT we mean by inspiration is that holy men of old—illuminated not only by the ordinary light of the Holy Spirit, which lighteth every man who is born into the world, but by His special grace—were used by God to make known to us those truths respecting Him, and His relation to the souls which He has made, which were of supreme moment, and which we could not have discovered by our unaided powers. Thus much respecting the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is capable of ample proof, and has been verified by the age-long experience of mankind. The *form* assumed by this revelation—the question whether, in any part of these sacred books, the truth was set forth in poetry or in legend, or in that ethopœic manner which may be most briefly described by the word “the Haggada”—is, in any case, of incomparably less importance than the idea which the revelation unfolds. The view taken by many most learned and faithful seekers after the absolute truth as to the date, origin, and real character of the Biblical records has, during the last half century, undergone an immense though silent revolution. The late Archbishop of York once said to me that the silence and certainty with which this change of view had been accomplished was one of the most remarkable features in the life of the present generation. Even fifty years ago there were millions of educated Christians who—looking upon the Bible with the eyes of præ-critical dogmatists like Calovius—regarded it almost as a miraculous fetish, possessed of a separate and inherent Divine entity; much as the Mussulman still degrades his Qur’an into a sort of automatic amulet. The Bible was *rightly* valued as *containing* all things necessary to salvation; it was *wrongly*

regarded as verbally dictated, inerrant, and free from every element of human limitation. Even had this view been as correct, as it is contrary to every phenomenon of the Bible itself, and to all that we learn from history, from science, from criticism, from psychology, from comparative religion, from the plain results of literary and linguistic criticism—results have clearly shown that this imagined stupendous and abnormal miracle has turned out to be purely useless. For, taking this book in hand, millions of Christians who have held the view that it *is* in every word, syllable, and letter the very and direct utterance of God, have yet proved themselves so unable to ascertain its true meaning that they have drawn from it, not only the most antagonistic, but, in some cases, even the most pestilent and abhorrent conclusions. The doctrine of the Church of England, and of every true branch of the Church of Christ, is that, while in matters of history, chronology, science, its details are not exempt from the possibilities of error; while its revelation is progressive, and in its earlier stages avowedly imperfect; while the moral conceptions of its writers, under the old Dispensation, did not always rise above the incomplete ideal of their own day, and in some instances reflect “the days of ignorance which God winked at”; yet the Holy Scriptures *contain* the messages of God, and alone are capable of teaching us all things necessary to salvation. If this vast, blessed, and irrefragable conclusion, which has made the Bible so inestimably precious to all sorts and conditions of men in every age and in every country, be entangled with humanly-invented theories as to what the Bible might have been *a priori* expected to be rather than what it is, then its unique influence will be seriously imperilled by these false theories, which sober and unbiassed reason cannot but repudiate. By claiming for the Bible, in the interests of mere human dogma, far more than it ever

claims for itself, and far more than wise and competent faithfulness, aided by the slowly widening light of God, can now admit, we shall inevitably endanger the unique and legitimate authority of the Divine messages.

It is therefore a duty for all thoughtful Christians in the present age to prevent the injury which might arise from any sudden shock of disturbance in the inevitable change which must come—as certainly as the change from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican system of the universe—in the abandonment of untenable theories and dogmas about the true nature of Scripture inspiration.

When a scholar, who has acquired high reputation as a philologist, as Professor Sayce has done, says “that the belief that Moses wrote the Pentateuch seems to me to *involve considerably fewer difficulties* than does the contrary belief of the higher criticism”; and when he adds, “I see no reason for denying that the Pentateuch is substantially the work of Moses” (*Cont. Rev.*, p. 483), his remark cannot but come with a shock of surprise to that army of devoted inquirers and learned scholars in Germany, England, and America who have been forced to the conclusion—now admitted *in substance* by many critics and apologists of the old school—that the existence of at least three separate documents, as well as the work of at least one redactor, is clearly demonstrated by the phenomena presented by the Pentateuch; and that parts of these documents, at least in their present form, cannot be much, if at all, anterior to the epoch of the Return from the Exile.

It seems therefore a duty to state in the simplest way, and for ordinary readers, the reasons which have forced this view on most of the great learned and original inquirers of the day, and which have compelled many who have followed the course of their investigations to render an unhesitating consent to their main conclusions.

It is no part of my task to give even a meagre sketch of the history of Biblical criticism. In its modern developments it may be said chiefly to date from the year 1753. In that year Jean Astruc, the physician of Louis XIV., discovered and published a luminous principle, which, though it long lay buried under the white embers of perfunctory assumption and casuistical "explanation," could not finally be quenched. He discovered, and by his very discovery may be said to have finally and conclusively *proved*, that the Book of Genesis is *not a homogeneous composition*. It is a remarkable and a deeply humiliating fact that, after at least two thousand years, during which Jews and Christians had accepted the Old Testament Scriptures as "the oracles of God," all of them alike—Rabbis, Fathers, Theologians, Schoolmen, and numbers of Angelic, Seraphic, Cherubic, Irrefragable, and most Christian Doctors—had piled mountain-loads of exegesis on the sacred books, and yet had read them so carelessly, so superficially, so disconnectedly, so uncritically, as not even to notice the obvious linguistic facts which lie upon their surface. It was left for an accidental physician in 1753—a physician who prided himself only on his *medical* books—to point out the circumstance—so self-evident when once it has been noticed—that there are *at least* two main and separate documents running side by side in the first books of the Bible. Vitrina, in his *Observationes Sacrae* (i. 4 § 2), seems to have been hovering on the verge of the discovery,¹ but it was left for Astruc to enunciate it in his anonymous *Conjectures sur les Mémoires Originaux dont il est permis de croire que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le Livre de la Genèse, avec des Remarques qui éclaircissent ces Conjectures*. He thought that Genesis had

¹ "Schedas et scrinia Patrum apud Israelitas conservata, Mosem collegisse, digessisse, ornasce, et ubi deficiebant compluisse." This is perhaps the earliest germ of the documentary hypothesis.

consisted of two principal works, marked respectively by the use of the names *Elohim* and *Jahveh*, and mixed up with the fragments of ten other documents.¹ He supposed that these had been put together by Moses in twelve columns side by side, and had subsequently been amalgamated by transcribers in a confused and sometimes erroneous manner. His book, so far from being a contribution to scepticism or "rationalism" (except in the best sense of that ill-used word), was an avowed answer to the hitherto unanswerable objections of keen-sighted unbelievers.

The fruitful element of truth which lay in this crude, fragmentary hypothesis was too certain and too valuable to be forgotten. Its sifting, testing, elucidation, and completion required the ardent self-devotion of generations of open-minded and gifted toilers; and since scholars of unwearied diligence, and of unbiassed passion for the pure, simple, unsophisticated truth, are rare, it has taken nearly a century and a half to utilize and develop the discovery of Astruc. In our own lifetime, it has been finally elaborated into those conclusions which now furnish a common basis for the Biblical studies of all the leading scholars of Germany, and which, in their main outlines, even avowed apologists of the archaic style of Biblical criticism no longer venture to reject. In England, such is the ignorance of professed interpreters, the belief that the Elohist and Jehovist documents were separate can hardly even yet be said to be generally accepted; but I heard it familiarly taught, as a matter of universal knowledge, to a large class of German boys at Naumburg, in the Schulpforta—"the Eton of Prussia"—in a visit which I paid to that school with the present Archbishop of Canterbury forty years ago.

Those who wish to learn how the first suggestion of the

¹ See Quarry *On Genesis*, p. 401.

documentary hypothesis has been quickened to its present proportions by subsequent writers, must read the story in various modern Introductions. Among the leading critics we may mention Semler († 1791), Herder († 1803), Eichhorn († 1827), Ilgen († 1834), De Wette († 1849), Bleek († 1859), Graf († 1869), Bishop Colenso (1883), Vatke († 1882), Ewald († 1875), Kuenen († 1891). The attempts of learned but reactionary theologians, such as Hengstenberg († 1869), Hävernicks († 1846), and Keil († 1888), to stem these views have so completely failed that these theologians can hardly be said to have left any successors or representatives, at any rate in Germany. A host of other learned writers, most of them now living, or who have only died recently, while they differ as to many minor details, are now at one as to the main facts. Among them we may mention Hupfeld, Knobel, Ewald, Strack, Kayser, Nöldeke, Schrader, König, Cornill, Dillmann, Holzinger, Kautzsch, Socin, Stade, Kittel, Wellhausen, Reuss, Addis, Prof. Driver, Prof. Cheyne, Prof. Briggs, Prof. Sanday, Prof. Ryle, Prof. Bevan, and the late Prof. W. Robertson Smith.

These, and multitudes of other scholars, have treated the books of the Bible in the only way in which we can arrive at the truth respecting them. They have made them speak for themselves and reveal their own secrets. They have discovered their real nature from their actual phenomena. They have tabulated the results which they furnish to the microscope and spectrum-analysis of that impartial inductive study, which firmly believes that the evolution of true knowledge is light from heaven. They have been guided by fearless confidence in that revealing light of God, "which shows all things in the slow history of their ripening," and which can never lead astray.

As the result of the labours of all these indefatigable scholars and profound Hebraists, one broad and general

result may now be regarded as absolutely *proven*; namely, that, leaving out of sight all minor details, and the incorporation of glosses, traditional fragments of song, and various explanatory clauses by later redactors, *the Pentateuch, as a whole*,¹ together with the Book of Joshua, which properly belongs to it, *is based on the combination of THREE independent, original, and in most instances easily distinguishable documents*. By the existence of these documents we can explain not only a mass of other historic *data*, but also the repeated occurrence in the same book of deutero-graphs, repetitions, variations, contradictions incapable of any honest or scientific reconciliation; of divergent and self-contradictory laws; of divergent names; and of many chronological difficulties. None of these variations are of any *religious* or *spiritual* importance, and they need no explanation when we trace them to the co-existence of differing traditions, and to the records of different authors, preserved by rough incorporation into books, which, in some instances at least, did not assume their final form till long years after the appearance of the documents of which they are composed.

These constituent documents of the Hexateuch are not only marked by the existence of minor repetitions and divergencies, but each of them has its own moral and religious colouring; its own prominent conception; its own predominant aim; its own marked style, method, outline, and favourite expressions. They are thus separated from each other by material differences in the substance and object, and also by formal differences in style, in phraseology, in numbers, in facts, and in the predominant religious standpoint, as well as in the names by which they normally speak of God. And these differentiating marks,

¹ Ἡ πεντάτευχος βίβλος, "the book in five volumes," is a name which originated among the Alexandrian Jews. The Palestinian Jews called it "the five-fifths of the Law."

as Prof. Driver says, are *concomitant*. They "are not isolated, nor do they occur in the narrative indiscriminately. They are numerous, and reappear with singular persistency *in combination with each other*; they are, in a word, so marked that they can only be accounted for upon the supposition that the sections in which they occur are by different hands."¹ It is even possible, with approximate probability, to conjecture the age in which each of the documents was written, the regions in which they first saw the light, and the schools of thought from which they respectively emanated.² The induction which has led to their separation is based on many different lines of observation, especially the study of the history of worship, of the Hebrew language, and of Hebrew literature.

The main documents of the Hexateuch are as follows:—

1. P. There is one document which forms the predominant *stratum* in which all the others are embedded, and which is traceable throughout the Hexateuch. It was long called in Germany the *Grundschrift*,³ or "Book of Origins." Dillmann refers to it as A; Wellhausen calls it Q, because it prominently emphasizes *four* (Quatuor) Covenants of God with the Holy People. It is most commonly and conveniently designated by the letter P, as being connected with the Priestly Code. It is in its main purpose a book of laws. It is much later than E and J, and it told the story of Israel, from the creation, from the standpoint of priestly enactments, of which some are considered to be

¹ *Introd.*, p. 8.

² Prof. Ives Curtiss (*Expositor*, 1886) remarks that if we did not possess the Gospels, but only Tatian's *Diatessaron*, we should have before us a problem similar to that presented by Genesis. "The books of Genesis and Leviticus contain no statement as to how or by whom they were committed to writing" (Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, p. 12).

³ A name given it by Tuch and Nöldeke. It was also at one time distinguished as E (Ewald's mistaken *elder* Elohist), from its use of *Elohim* or *El Shaddai* for God up to Exodus vi. 3. Ewald called it The Book of Origins (*Ursprünge*), by which he translated the Hebrew word *Tôldôth*, which marks one of its main characteristic divisions.

post-exilic,¹ and of which, at any rate, there were very few traces till the return from the Exile.

2. E. A narrative of an Elohist writer, who most commonly uses the name *Elohim*. It is predominantly a book of Judaic history, or of legends, beginning with the patriarchs and extending through the Book of Joshua.

3. J. A narrative by a writer who from the first uses the name *Yahveh*, and is therefore called the Yahvist or Jehovist. It is an outcome of the prophetic schools, and breaks off, according to Wellhausen, with the blessing of Balaam.²

4. J E.³ The additions of an editor who appears to have combined the works of the Elohist and the Yahvist (E and J) into one narrative before they were interwoven with P by one or more later editors. The separate traces of this redactor are, however, less easily and less certainly distinguishable than those of the others, and are, from the nature of his task, of subordinate importance.⁴ The result of his labours was that "there were two historico-legal works in existence (P and J E), both running parallel from the creation to the settlement of Israel in Canaan."⁵ The history of worship alone involves four marked stages of progress—the Jehovistic (B.C. 850), the Deuteronomic (B.C. 621), the Ezekielian (B.C. 573), the Priestly (B.C. 444).

¹ This is the view of Budde, Stade, Duhm, Schultz, König, Cornill, Kayser, Kautzsch, Smend, etc.

² "The Yahvist and Elohist, with differences in detail, breathe the same spirit. They are historians, or 'collectors of national myths and legends,' rather than legalists. But there are differences between them. The Yahvist uses *Yahveh* throughout, the Elohist never till Exodus iii. The Yahvist calls Jacob in his later life Israel, the Elohist retains the name Jacob. The Yahvist speaks of Sinai, the Elohist of Horeb," etc. (See Addis, pp. lv., lvi.).

³ Wellhausen somewhat confusingly calls J E the *Jehovist*, and J the *Yahvist*. (*Einleit. in das Alte Test.*, p. 178).

⁴ The two theories which prevailed during the dawn of criticism—(1) that the Hexateuch was a book of *fragments*; (2) that it was one main narrative (P) *supplemented* by others—are now seen to be incorrect. The book is a whole made up of distinct documents.

⁵ Prof. Curtiss (*EXPOSITOR*, 1886).

These vary from each other as to the four particulars of time, place, mode, and persons of Jewish cult; and there is an observable difference not only as to the institutions, but also as to the *tone* and *spirit* of the worship.¹

The main distinguishing characteristics of these four documents are as follows :—

1. P. The Priestly narrative.

This document is specially important in the first eleven chapters of Genesis, because it forms a large part of them.

It runs through the entire Hexateuch, and is essentially the *Lawbook* of Israel. It was designed to set forth the ordinances, rites, customs, and usages which prevailed, or were intended to prevail, among the chosen people as a congregation rather than as a kingdom. The history is only used as the basis of institutions, or as the explanation of their origin. Thus the opening chapters of Genesis are intended as a sketch of the great phases of Divine government, by which, even from the foundation of the world, the holy nation was elected by God to be “a people of His own possession,” and was separated by marked epochs of advancing disseverment from the other tribes and nations of the world. It is with this view, and not solely for their own importance, that the writer narrates the Creation, the Deluge, the Covenant with Noah, the Dispersion of mankind, the overthrow of haughty world-empires, the call of Abraham, the covenant with Abraham, and the covenant with Israel.

One indication of this purpose in P is the tenfold recurrence of the phrase, *These are the generations* (*tôldôth*) of—literally, “the begettings” or “genealogies.” This phrase forms a sort of running headline, to mark off the stories of

1. The creation of heaven and earth. Gen. ii. 4 ff.

¹ Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 117-124 and *passim*. Kautzsch and Socin have printed the documents of Genesis in different types (*Die Genesis*, 1888), and Bacon (*The Genesis of Genesis*, 1891) has printed them apart.

2. The story of the descendants of Adam through Seth to Noah. v. 1 ff.
3. The story of Noah and his sons. vi. 9 ff.
4. The story of the sons of Noah, and the nations descended from them. x. 1 ff.
5. The line of Shem down to Terah, the father of Abram. xi. 10 ff.
6. The line and descendants of Terah to the death of Abram. xi. 27 ff.
7. The line of Ishmael and the Arab tribes which sprang from him. xxv. 12 ff.
8. The line of Isaac and the story of his two sons, till Isaac's death. xxvi. 1 ff.
9. The line of Esau and his descendants. xxxvi. 9 ff.
10. The line of Jacob and the story of his descendants till the death of Joseph. xxxvii. 2 ff.

Another characteristic of P is its annalistic style. The narratives are presented in a somewhat bare and dry form, with systematic statistics, genealogies, and chronological statements, which are in entire subservience to a juristic purpose. The writer dislikes all gross anthropomorphism, and omits stories of the patriarchs which offended his moral sense. He abounds in recurrent and somewhat technical expressions.¹ His work is systematic in its structure and concrete in its delineations. It avoids poetic turns and pictures. We infer, especially from large parts of Leviticus which belong to it, that this narrative took its present form among the Priesthood of Jerusalem, in all probability after the days of Ezekiel and in the epoch of the Exiles. The writer is chiefly occupied with the theocracy rather than with humanity. His promises are limited to Israel, and his interest is in Levitic ceremonialism rather than in the

¹ For 50 phrases characteristic of P, see Driver, *Introd.*, pp. 123-128; Briggs, *Hexateuch*, pp. 175-180.

deep universal problems of theology and the passionate yearnings of the human heart.

This document (P) is marked in character and singularly homogeneous. The part of it contained in the first eleven chapters of Genesis is meant as the vestibule to the great temple which it desires to construct. It dwells on the Creation, the Deluge, and the Covenant with Noah as preludes to the covenants with Abraham, Jacob, and Moses, and "as an introduction to the systematic view of the theocratic institutions which is to follow in Exodus to Numbers, and which it is the main object of the author to exhibit."

2. E. The Elohist.

The document E is distinguishable by the use of the name *Elohim* for God till Exodus iii., together with other characteristics which separate it decisively from P.¹ Dillmann describes it as the Legendary History of Israel,² and believes it to be largely based on oral tradition. It is generally agreed that the writer was a citizen of the northern kingdom. It abounds in special details about names, incidents, antiquities, sacred rites, and facts of local interest, and shows special regard for the dominance of Joseph and of the tribe of Ephraim. Unlike P, it refers freely to angels and dream-revelations, and has none of the marked antipathy of the priestly code for local sanctuaries, nor even for pillars (*Matstseboth*) and Teraphim. This document is of less importance for the earlier chapters of Genesis, since it first makes its distinct and continuous appearance in chapter xx. Its narratives seem to be often mingled up with those of J, and the ultimate analysis of these two documents is not certain in details though agreed upon in general outlines. E is more objective than P, and

¹ The writer sometimes uses *Elohim* even after Exodus iii.; and Dillmann thinks that originally he may have used that name throughout.

² Dillmann, *Genesis*, p. xi.

less consciously tinged with moral and doctrinal thoughts. In the matchless narrative of Joseph the writer shows his delight in didactic history.¹

3. J. The Yahvist or Jehovist.

The third or Jehovistic document adopts from the first the name Yahveh, and may be described as distinctively the Prophetic narrative.² In Dillmann's opinion it emanated from Judah, a conclusion which he deduces from the exaltation of Judah (xxxvii. 26 ff., xliii. 4 ff., etc.), and from the interest displayed in the Negeb, or south country (xxi. 33, xxvi. 23-25, etc.). The Yahvist goes over many of the same facts as the author of P—the Creation, the Flood, the race of Noah, parts of the history of Abraham, etc. His narrative is the most graphic and literary in form. Many of his passages are "masterpieces of narration"; they are flowing, eloquent, tender, graceful, and marked by an infinite charm and pathos. He is also a deeper and more earnest psychologist than the other writers, as is shown by his account of the origin of sin and the method of God's compassion in dealing with it, and obliterating its ominous effects on the world and man. At the same time he speaks of Jehovah with frank and anthropomorphic simplicity (ii. 15 ff., vi. 6, vii. 16, viii. 21, etc.). "His characteristic feature," says Prof. Driver, "may be said to be the fine vein of ethical and theological reflexion which pervades his work throughout, and the manner in which his narrative, even more than that of E, becomes the vehicle of religious teaching."

¹ For other characteristics which distinguish E from J, see Addis, pp. lv., lvi.; Dillmann, pp. 617, 623 ff.

² "Jehovah" only occurs four times *by itself* in the A.V., and five times in proper names. It is generally rendered "the Lord." The parallel accounts of E and P respectively as to the revelation of the name are found in Exodus iii. 12-15 (E); Exodus vi. 2-7 (P). In the latter short paragraph alone there are twelve of P's characteristic phrases (Briggs, *Hexateuch*, p. 166). It may be said briefly that the name *Elohim* represents "the God of Nature," and *Jehovah* represents "the God of Revelation" (Driver, p. 11). The Yahvist freely uses *Elohim* when qualified by another word, *e.g.*, "God of Israel," etc.

It is by no means easy to settle the relative ages of E and J. The latest writers — Wellhausen, Kuenen, and Stade—think that the date of J is about B.C. 850-800, and the date of E not later than B.C. 750.

4. J E. The Redactor.

The Redactor, whose work it was to unite the separate narratives of J and E, naturally occupies a place of subordinate importance. He was rather an editor than an independent author. Critics, however, think that they can point to distinct traces of his handiwork. It is not impossible that this Redactor was Ezra himself, about B.C. 444.¹ All Hebrew tradition points to the important part which he played in the "writing" and editing of the canonical books.²

Schrader calls P "the annalistic narrator," and E "the theocratic narrator." He thinks that they wrote in complete independence of each other. J, "the prophetic narrator," weaves them together and fills them up by narratives of his own.³ "It is agreed among critics that E is brief, terse, and archaic in his style. J is poetic and descriptive; as Wellhausen says, 'the best narrator in the Bible.' His imagination and fancy are ever active. P is annalistic and diffuse; he aims at precision and completeness. The logical faculty prevails. There is little colour."⁴

Meanwhile it cannot be too strongly insisted upon that the traditional view which sufficed during the apparently total abeyance of the critical faculty for thousands of years, has, for every thoughtful and competent scholar, become absolutely and finally untenable. To maintain it is to maintain a literary impossibility, and an historic error. If we take an ancient book, subject it to careful analysis, and

¹ See König, *Einleit.*, p. 48.

² The Mishnic Rabbis say that Ezra and the men of the Great Synagogue "wrote" the Books of Moses, etc.

³ Schrader (*De Wette, Einleit.*); Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, p. 162.

⁴ Briggs, p. 74.

find that it contains the plainest and most unmistakable traces of

Differences of style ;
Differences of statement ;
Differences of conception ; and
Differences of phraseology,

in two or more markedly distinct and easily separable documents, it is a folly for off-hand dogmatists or reactionary theologians to ask us to be untrue to the light of reason which God has given us and still to maintain the idle notion that the Pentateuch was all, or nearly all, the work of Moses about B.C. 1491. Such a view must be finally abandoned.

Let us glance at some of these differences as we find them even in the first eleven chapters of Genesis and up to xii. 6.

1. *Differences of Language.*

To show how closely, how laboriously, how microscopically this subject has been studied, I append a summary of the facts as furnished by Professors Green and Harper in *Hebraica*, vol. v.

Hebrew, it must be remembered, is a language singularly poor in its vocabulary, and remarkable for its inflexibility; yet out of 485 words—the total vocabulary of this section—118 are used by P alone, 246 by J alone, and only 121 are used by P and J in common.

P uses 239 words in 1,858 forms; each word 7.77 times.

J „ 367 „ „ 1,762 „ „ „ 4.8 „

P „ 239 „ in about 150 verses; for each verse 1.58 new words.

J „ 367 „ „ 140 „ „ „ 2.62 „ „

Of the 118 „ used by P alone, 56 are fairly characteristic

„ 246 „ „ J „ 104 „ „

Such facts cannot possibly be accidental.

2. As to *Differences of Style*, we have already seen that P is systematic, chronological, statistical, precise, stereo-

typed and rigid in conception, but verbose and iterative in form, and generic rather than individual; while J is free, flowing, general, picturesque, poetic, anthropomorphic, didactic, individual.

3. As regards *Differences of Material*, we find *both* in P and J, with variant detail, an account of the creation; a genealogical table; a statement of the world's wickedness; a great flood; the deliverance of one family with representatives of all kinds of beasts; a promise that there should be no more deluge; a table of nations; a more or less full genealogy of Terah; and the family and migration of Abraham.¹

How can these duplicate narratives be accounted for except on the hypothesis of different authors?

4. And in these duplicate narratives there are *Differences of Statement*, amounting in some instances to distinct discrepancies and contradictions.

Such, for instance, are, among others,—

The order of events in Creation;

The creation of Eve;

The number of clean and unclean beasts which went into the Ark.

The dates for the continuance of the rain, etc.

5. There are *Differences of Conception*.

P is rigidly monotheistic, and, so to speak, distantly timent in his conception of, and all his allusions to, God, whom he calls Elohim, or El Shaddai.

J is anthropomorphic to an extent which often leads the early versions to modify his daring expressions.

To quote, then, the summary of Prof. W. K. Harper :

¹ There are, further, two accounts of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah; two of the name Beersheba; two of the name Bethel, of the name Israel, of the names of Esau's wives, of Esau's settlement in Seir. See for further details Kuenen, *The Hexateuch*, p. 39; Briggs, pp. 75-80; Kittel, *Gesch. d. Hebräer*, i. 123-151.

“(1) We divide these chapters into two divisions, simply on the basis of the use of the Divine names, regarding as doubtful chapters ii., iii., which have the double phrase *Yahweh-Elohim*. (2) We go through each division and note the language; we discover many words and phrases which occur in one but not in the other; words and phrases, too, for which, in the other division, corresponding expressions are found. It seems strange that wherever *Elohim* is used, it is accompanied by a certain series of words, and that it is just so in the use of *Yahweh*. (3) We go through again, and we discover that one division has everywhere a certain style (rigid, stereotyped, etc.), and that the other has a style quite the opposite (free, flowing, poetical). (4) We examine the passages again, and this time discover that really each division takes up the same events, the same history (creation, deluge, etc.). (5) We take it up again, and, to our surprise, notice that each division, in spite of the similarity of material, has its own peculiar and widely different conception of God, etc. What must be the result of this five-fold examination? Is this the work of one man or two?”

If it be asked, What, then, becomes of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, which was implicitly believed for so many centuries? the answer is that it must of course be given up. But, as Luther said more than three centuries ago, “What does it matter to religion whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch or not?”¹ The book nowhere lays claim, even indirectly, much less directly, to having been written by Moses. He is merely bidden in one or two places (*Exod.* xvii. 14, xxxiv. 27; *Num.* xxxiii. 2, etc.) to write down certain things “in a book”; and we are told in *Deuteronomy* xxxi. 9 that “Moses wrote the words of this (*Deuteronomic*) law.” Throughout the history Moses is spoken of in the third person, and often in a way which he would not himself have used (*Exod.* vi. 26, 27, xi. 3, etc.). Early Jewish tradition (2 *Esd.* xiv. 22–45) attributes to Ezra a large share in the reproduction of the Pentateuch after the law had been burnt; and some work in the collection of the sacred books is assigned to Nehemiah in 2 *Macc.*

¹ So Melchior Canus, quoted by Matthew Poole, said, “It is not much material to the Catholick faith that any book was written by this or that author so long as the Spirit of God is believed to be the author of it.”

ii. 13 (comp. Ezra vii. 6). The Fathers accepted the view of the great share which Ezra took in the editing of the law. "God inspired Ezra," says Irenæus (*Hæc.*, iii. 21, 2), "to recast all the words of former prophets." "Whether you wish to say that Moses is the author of the Pentateuch, and that Ezra restores it," says St. Jerome, "is indifferent to me."¹

If it be further asked, In what way do these irrefragable critical conclusions affect our estimate of the Bible, and modify our traditional views of the dogma of inspiration? the question deserves, on every ground, a serious answer.

1. As regards the Bible, those who love the Bible most, those who have most deeply profited by the Divine teaching which it contains, ought to be more jealously careful than any others that they do not blindly and wilfully adopt for it a claim which it never makes for itself. They should strive not to mingle their conception of it with things which, as earnest and prayerful consideration ought to convince the most stereotyped intelligence, are wholly incapable of proof, even if they be not—as the vast majority of the ablest Christian scholars and thinkers are now convinced—demonstrable falsities. To worship a book as absolutely Divine throughout, when it abounds in traces of human handiwork and human limitations, is nothing short of idolatry, even if it be disguised under the name of bibliolatry.² The extravagant fiction that the sacred writers were "not only [penmen, but *pens* of the Holy Ghost," and that all they say is infallibly true and equally Divine, is directly contrary to the teaching of Christ and His apostles.

¹ Jer. *adv. Helvid.* See other passages quoted in Briggs, *Hexateuch*, p. 33.

² That this was the tendency of some post-Reformation theologians may be illustrated by the fact that some dogmatists almost elevated the Bible into a sort of "Fourth Person of the Holy Trinity," and in all respects argued as if God wrote every word. Nietzsche seriously questioned whether Holy Scripture could be called a creature, and decided that it could not. See ample proofs in my "Bampton Lectures" (*Hist. of Interpretation*, pp. 369-376).

It is an error which has been fruitful of many of the darkest superstitions and crimes which have tortured and degraded the human race. Monstrous superstructures of priestly tyranny and usurpation have, to the curse of nations, been built like inverted pyramids on the narrow apex of perverted texts. The treatment of partially human documents which enshrine divine lessons as though those documents were themselves, throughout their whole extent, supernatural, has led to the unnatural systems of exegesis which have prevailed for centuries of ignorance. Such a dogma, in many instances, degrades the words of Holy Scripture into meaningless or insoluble enigmas.

Such, then, is a brief and most imperfect sketch of the phenomena of the Hexateuch. They are capable of verification by any student who has the patience to test them. There may be minute errors of detail in the statement; there may be elaborately tortuous trains of casuistical 'apologetic' by which we may semblably explain away some of the phenomena; but can any one doubt what would be the conclusions formed on such evidence if no vague traditions and dogmatic shibboleths tended to prevent their acceptance?

God is the God of the Amen; the God of essential and eternal verity. If we are driven to inferences respecting the Holy Book which enshrines His messages such as are at variance with traditional conceptions, what is our plain duty? Which is the better and nobler course—to accept those inferences, and correct by their means our previous mistaken views, or to harden and sophisticate our reason against them, and so—as far as we ourselves are concerned, and without for a moment pretending to sit in judgment on others—to go before this God of truth with the unclean sacrifice of a lie in our right hands?

F. W. FARRAR.

BASIL OF CÆSAREIA.

THE latest volume in the "Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers,"¹ brings prominently before us one who was probably the most vigorous, striking, and manly figure in the Church of Asia Minor under the empire of Constantinople, though some blemishes of temper and of pride have combined with a certain hardness and want of sympathy in his nature to render him an object of less interest in history than he deserves. Mr. Jackson's translation is at once pleasant to read as English, and true to the letter and to the spirit of the original; and we may hope that it will succeed (as it deserves) in drawing more attention on the part of classical scholars to the varied interest of the Christian writers of the period in question. The voluminous writings of the three contemporary Cappadocians, Basil and the two Gregories, apart from the purely theological and ecclesiastical interest, possess a high value as storing up many facts about the state of society and of education, about the administration and law of the late Roman Empire as practically affecting the people, about the taxpayers' views on taxation, the travellers' views as to the roads and the seasons, the householders' views on the safety of his property, the merchants' and the investors' views on the public credit and the standard of commercial honesty; in short, about the ordinary life of a highly organized community, in which the oriental style of society and manners was being replaced by the European; and, above all, they show us the views entertained by three men of power and education as to the duties of the Church in its relation to all these various interests. A study of the three great Cappadocians

¹ St. Basil: *Letters and Select Works* (treatise "de Spiritu Sancto" and the nine Homilies of the Hexaemeron), translated with notes and prolegomena by the Rev. Blomfield Jackson, M.A.

from this point of view would make a most instructive and interesting work.

In Mr. Jackson's *prolegomena* we have a careful account of the life of Basil, and a very full account of the works which are not translated here. In the biography, the results of earlier writers, Tillemont and Maran (the Benedictine editor), are worked up; and there is added to them a much more precise localization of the scenes, in which recent geographical discoveries are utilized. Naturally, however, the biography is secondary to the translation; and there is still need for a careful study of the life of Basil and for a more exact determination of the dates of his letters as well as of the larger works. Several interesting incidents in his history seem to me not to have been properly understood; and the dates assigned to some letters by the Benedictine editor (and accepted by Mr. Jackson) are in several cases not convincing and even quite unsatisfactory.¹ While we cannot enter on any such wider questions within our narrow limits, we may profitably devote the pages of this article to studying, under the guidance of Mr. Jackson, a few passages which bring out some personal characteristics of "St. Basil the Great"; and, at the same time, the quotations will exemplify the spirit and excellence of the translation in this volume.

The letter which faced me, as I first opened the volume, No. 135, may be taken as a specimen, selected at random, of the translation and of Basil's expression. Basil acknowledges two books which Diodorus, presbyter of Antioch (afterwards bishop of Tarsus), had sent him for perusal. "With the second," he says, "I was delighted, not only with its brevity . . . but because it is at once full of thought and so arranged that the objections of opponents and the answers to them stand out distinctly . . . The

¹ The biography of Basil in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, meritorious and useful as it is, is too much guided by the earlier modern authorities.

former work, which has practically the same force, but is much more elaborately adorned with rich diction, many figures, and niceties of dialogue, seems to me to require considerable time to read and much mental labour, both to gather its meaning and retain it in the memory. The abuse of our opponents and the support of our own side, which are thrown in, although they may seem to add some charms of dialectic to the treatise, do yet break the continuity of the thought and weaken the strength of the argument by causing interruption and delay . . . If the subject of the dialogue be wide and general, digressions against persons interrupt its continuity and tend to no good end. . . . So much I have written to prove that you did not send your work to a flatterer . . . I have, however, now sent back the larger and earlier of the two volumes, after perusing it as far as I have been able.¹ The second I have retained with the wish to transcribe it, but hitherto without finding any quick writer."²

This letter conveys a very favourable impression (and a correct impression) of Basil's tone to his friends, and to those who thought like himself: it is judicious in its criticism, pointed and simple in expression, polite and kindly in tone; it advises without assumption, and encourages without flattering.

Everywhere the warmth of Basil's affection for friends and relatives, and the pleasant recollection of old associations, combined with his good sense and lofty tone, convey a most favourable impression. Take a few examples: "One would rather see his friend, though angry with him, than anybody else, flattering him. Do not, then, cease

¹ The effect of this rather suggestive statement is toned down in the original by a sentence here omitted about Basil's weak health.

² This shows a rather low standard of the book-trade in Cæsarea, one of the greatest commercial cities of the East. Without such scribes, the publication of an edition of a book was impossible. A similar statement is made by Gregory Nyss. *Ep.* 15 (Migne).

preferring charges like the last! The very charge will mean a letter; and nothing can be more precious or delightful to me" (*Ep.* 21). Or this: "Now for my sins, I have lost my mother, the only comfort I had in life. Do not smile if, old as I am, I lament my orphanhood. Forgive me if I cannot endure separation from a soul, to compare with whom I see nothing in the future that lies before me. So once more my complaints have come back to me; once more I am confined to my bed, tossing about in my weakness, and every hour all but looking for the end of life" (*Ep.* 30). Or again, these recollections of childhood from *Ep.* 271: "To travel once again in memory to our young days, and to be reminded of old times, when for both of us there was one home, one hearth, the same schoolmaster, the same leisure, the same work, the same treats, the same hardships, and everything shared in common! What do you think I would not have given to recall all this by actually meeting you, to rid me of the heavy weight of my old age, and to seem to be turned from an old man into a lad again!"

But it was not pleasant to be on the opposite side from Basil. Speaking of the Arians, he is hardly to be trusted even as to facts. He felt too bitterly; and he exaggerated so rhetorically, that his words cannot be taken literally. Thus in *Ep.* 242 he declares that in the thirteen years of Arian persecution "the Churches have suffered more tribulations than all those that are on record since Christ's gospel was first preached"—an utterly unjustifiable statement (against which Mr. Jackson rightly, perhaps too mildly, protests, as "not to be taken literally"). The harsh and rude invective which Basil uses about his opponents is the fault of his age, and, while we regret it, we cannot wonder at it.

Difficult, however, as it is to appreciate the real character of the Arian controversy as a question of social life, on

the whole we gather, I think, that the progressive tendencies were on the side of Basil, and acquiescence in the existing standard of morality characterized the Arian point of view. The "Orthodox" Church was still the champion of higher aspirations, and Basil, however harsh he was to all who differed from him, was an ennobling and upward-struggling force in the life of his time. At a later period the facts changed; and, in the Iconoclast period, the sympathy of the modern student must, I think, be almost wholly against the successors of Basil, and in favour of the maligned and despised heretics.

The contest in which Basil was involved against the imperial power in regard to the division of Cappadocia into two provinces produced the most striking scenes of his life, and displayed both his strongest qualities and his worst faults of character. The questions at issue in this contest seem not to have been correctly apprehended by writers on the life of Basil. The policy of the Byzantine rule had been uniformly directed to subdividing the great provinces, and thus diminishing the power of provincial governors. Subdivision was the natural result of the centralization of authority, the exaggeration of the power of the court, and the diminishing of the power of officials at a distance from the court. Cappadocia was by far the largest of the provinces; its turn had now come to be subdivided, and in 371 the Emperor Valens resolved on this step. He may probably have been roused to it by the fact that the influence of Cæsareia, under its vigorous and uncompromising "orthodox" bishop, was dead against his ecclesiastical policy. It was natural that he should wish to diminish that influence; but in itself the subdivision would naturally have been soon made even by an orthodox emperor; and at a later time Justinian divided Cappadocia into three parts. The bias of Valens was shown, however, by his leaving the smaller part of Cappadocia to the metropolis Cæsareia, and

making the new province of Secunda Cappadocia decidedly larger. The officials who lived at Cæsareia, and the business which came to it, were much diminished, as the province of which it was the metropolis shrank to less than half its former size. The city, naturally, regarded the change with dismay, and protested strongly. Basil exerted himself to the utmost; but the three letters which he wrote intreating the intercession of certain influential persons with Valens in favour of Cæsareia, are among the poorest in the collection.¹ They are inflated and exaggerated in their description of the loss that would result to Cæsareia; they show no appreciation either on the one hand of the real causes that recommended the subdivision, or on the other of the weighty reasons that might have been urged against the centralizing policy. In fact the whole system of the orthodox Church was in favour of centralization; and Basil himself would have been the most vigorous supporter of that policy in any case where it did not affect his own city and his own archbishopric. He could not argue on strong grounds against the change, for his whole system of thought debarred him from those grounds, and his protests are weak and hysterical.

The true greatness of Basil, however, shone forth immediately afterwards, when Valens came to Cæsareia. The archbishop triumphantly resisted the efforts made by the creatures of Valens to overawe him, and bend him to the will of the Arian emperor. Valens himself was not blind to the nobility and dignity of Basil's character; he left the archbishop in secure possession of his rank and the freedom

¹ *Epp.* 74, 75, 76. The first is addressed to Martinianus, who had some personal friendship with Basil; otherwise he is unknown, but he evidently was not a Cappadocian official. The profusion of literary allusions in the letter, and the compliments to the knowledge of history and of mankind that Martinianus possessed, suggest that he was a philosopher or man of letters. He evidently lived at some distance both from Constantinople and from Cappadocia. Mr. Jackson's statement that he was an official of Cappadocia rests on no ancient authority, and seems to me not to suit the letter.

of his opinions; he attended divine service performed by him in the cathedral; he held private conference with him; and he gave land¹ to endow Basil's new foundation, the hospital, etc., near Cæsareia. Considering how bitter was the quarrel at this time between the Arian and the orthodox party, Valens deserves more credit in this case than he has generally received. But, as to Basil, every one must say, with Mr. Jackson, that "his attitude seems to have been dignified without personal haughtiness, and to have shown sparks of that quiet humour which is rarely exhibited in great emergencies except by men who are conscious of right and careless of consequences to self."

But, in the following months, the quarrel with Anthimus, bishop of Tyana, the metropolis of the new province of Cappadocia Secunda, shows Basil at his worst. He struggled to maintain his former rights over the churches and monasteries of the new province with undignified pertinacity. He created new bishoprics, not on account of the needs of the Church, but to increase the number of his supporters and their weight; and his old friend Gregory of Nazianzos could hardly forget or forgive the way in which Basil used him for his own purposes by almost forcing him to become bishop of Sasima, one of these new sees. He went in person to collect the revenues of St. Orestes (what Gregory calls sarcastically his "supply of sucking-pigs and poultry from St. Orestes"), and his servants came almost to a battle with those of his rival. Basil certainly would have justified his action in the same terms that Innocent, bishop of Rome, used shortly afterwards, about 408, that it was not right that the Church of God should be altered to suit the changes of this world.² But every attempt made to maintain that principle, fine as

¹ Mr. Jackson's suggestion that they were part of the imperial estate of Macellum, beside Cæsareia, is very probable.

² See my *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, p. 93.

it seems in words, was a failure under the Empire, and must be a failure. The classification of dioceses was not of the essence of the Church; it naturally and properly varied with the changes of society, and prosperity, and political arrangement. The reason why Cæsareia had been an ecclesiastical centre lay originally in its being the political capital, and therefore the natural centre from which the province could best be affected and its churches directed. But, when Tyana had become the metropolis of considerable part of Cappadocia, it was merely introducing confusion to maintain that the cities of that province should look to Cæsareia ecclesiastically, and to Tyana in political, legal, and social respects. Neither Anthimus nor Basil showed in this case true dignity, or self-respect, or the respect due to a colleague; but, while no one cares about Anthimus, it is painful to those who respect and admire a great man to read about Basil's action, and above all to see his condemnation in the estrangement of his old friend Gregory, his supporter at first in the case.

Many touches of the raillery which became rude and unpleasant towards his opponents,¹ appear in a much more pleasant style when he writes to his friends.

He has found out that "there does seem something thinner than I was—I am thinner than ever."

In *Ep.* 4 he acknowledges a gift under the guise of a complaint that the giver is "evicting from our retreat my dear friend and nurse of philosophy, Poverty."

Twitting Gregory with the shortness of his letters, he says, "The letter is shown to be yours, not so much by the writing as by the style of the communication: in few words much is expressed."

The tone of these quotations doubtless gives the key to explain the rather enigmatic *Ep.* 1, where he speaks as if

¹ As when (*Ep.* 231) he calls one (perhaps Demosthenes, the agent of Valens) "the fat sea-monster" and "the old muleteer."

his travels through Syria and Egypt had been undertaken for the single purpose of meeting Eustathius, the philosopher, to whom the letter is addressed.

In *Ep.* 56, apologising for leaving a letter unanswered until his correspondent wrote again, he says, "I naturally forget very easily, and I have had lately many things to do, and so my natural infirmity is increased. I have no doubt, therefore, that you wrote to me, although I have no recollection of having received any letter from your excellency. . . . Really this letter of mine, as it is more than twice as bulky (as yours), will fulfil a double purpose. You see to what sophisms my idleness [surely laziness] drives me. . . . But, my dear sir, do not in a few words bring serious charges, indeed the most serious of all. Forgetfulness of one's friends, and neglect of them arising from high place, are faults which involve every kind of wrong. . . . I shall begin to forget you when I cease to know myself. Never, then, think that, because a man is a very busy man he is a man of faulty character."

The dignity, mingled with humility and desire for peace, shown in the two letters to his uncle Gregory, 59, 60, may be referred to as illustrating the graver and loftier side of his character.

As examples of the sound and high judgment, which placed him on the right side in most great social questions, we may quote the following. He writes to a physician, "In my opinion, to put your science at the head and front of life's pursuits is to decide reasonably and rightly" (*Ep.* 189).

He refers in *Ep.* 191 with longing admiration to the hospitable intercourse which "was once the boast of the Church. Brothers from each Church, travelling from one end of the world to the other, were provided with little tokens, and found all men fathers and brothers. But now," he says, "we are confined each in his own city, and every one looks at his neighbour with distrust."

In *Ep.* 73 he uses the whole influence of his position and of the Church to save some slaves from harsh punishment at the hands of Callisthenes, a government official¹ to whom they had behaved rudely. "Though you have sworn to deliver them to execution as the law enjoins, my rebuke is still of no less value, nor is the Divine law of less account than the laws current in the world." This episode would reward longer study than can here be given to it.

Basil's tone in addressing women lacks the charming ease that generally characterizes his letters to his male correspondents. An illustration is supplied in the two letters which he addressed to Nectarius, a noble of Cilicia, and his wife, on the death of their only son. The letter to Nectarius (No. 5), in spite of the rhetorical touch, "if all the streams run tears, they will not adequately weep our woe," is very fine, and the conclusion is charming, "Let us wait a little while, and we shall be once more with him. The time of our separation is not long, for in this life we are all like travellers on a journey, hastening on to the same shelter"; and so on in terms that have now become, through familiarity and repetition, less impressive than they were to Basil's contemporaries. But the letter to the bereaved mother is far inferior. "Alas, for the mighty mischief that the contact with an evil demon was able to wreak. Earth! what a calamity thou hast been compelled to sustain! If the sun had any feeling, one would think he might have shuddered," etc. After these bombastic commonplaces of rhetoric, he addresses the bereaved mother in almost equally frigid consolations. "When first you were made a mother, . . . you knew that, a mortal yourself, you had given birth to a mortal. What is there astonishing in the death of a mortal? . . . Look round at all the world in which you live; remember that every-

¹ He is shown to be an official by his having the power to send a soldier to Cæsareia with a message on the subject.

thing you see is mortal, and all subject to corruption. Look up to heaven, even it shall be dissolved; look at the sun, not even the sun will last for ever. All the stars together," etc., etc., "are subject to decay." In the early part of the letter Basil says, "I know what a mother's heart is"; but Mr. Jackson, in his note on the words, well remarks that the mother might have replied in the words of Constance to Pandulph.¹ Evidently he appreciates that externality and hardness of tone that characterizes the letter, and makes it more of a rhetorical exercise than a spontaneous outburst of sympathy.

A few passages occur to me in which it may be doubted whether Mr. Jackson has fully caught the meaning. For example, *Ep.* 8, 1, when, evidently, Basil is replying to a letter of the people of Cæsareia, asking him to return from his sojourn with Gregory, he says, "Give me, therefore, I beg you, a little time. I am not embracing a city life." Mr. Jackson adds the note: "*i.e.*, the life of the city, presumably Nazianzus, from which he is writing." But surely a person who writes to the great city of Cæsareia from the small town of Nazianzus, and speaks of "city life" (*τὴν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι διατριβήν*), must be referring to life in Cæsareia, not life in Nazianzus. Moreover, I cannot doubt, both from the context and the localities, that Basil was at the moment dwelling, not in Nazianzus, but in Carbala or Caprales (still called Gelvere), where Gregory's home was situated, where he was (as he intimates) enjoying the life of retirement and contemplation, and where to this day the memorials of Gregory are preserved, and the rock-cells mark the abode of many hermits in the succeeding ages.² I should venture to suggest that a thought has

¹ "He talks to me that never had a son."

² The exact localization of the home of Gregory, on the estate Arianzos, beside the village Carbala (or Caprales, Basil, *Ep.* 308), about eight miles south-west of Nazianzus (now called Nenizi), is made in *Historical Geography*

been left unexpressed by Basil from brevity and rapidity, and that the sense is, "a little time, pray, a little time grant me, I beg; [and then I shall come to you,] not welcoming the life of cities (for I am quite well aware of the danger caused to the soul in that life), but judging that the society of the saints [as contrasted with the solitary life of the hermit] is the most practically useful. [But grant me the delay,] for in the constant free interchange of ideas [with 'Gregory, Christ's mouth'] I am acquiring a deep-seated habit of contemplation." Elsewhere, also, Basil declares plainly his opinion that the life of action and public work is the more honourable, as it is the more wearisome and difficult and unpleasant side of the truly religious life.

As another example, take *Ep.* 190, § 1: "The most careless observer must at once perceive that it is in all respects more advantageous for care and anxiety to be divided among several bishops." This reads like a general maxim intended for wide application; but the Greek seems to me to need a different sense, applying solely to the case of Isaura, now under consideration, "it is more advantageous that the care of the district be divided¹ among several bishops." The case, which had been referred to Basil by Amphilochius, archbishop of Iconium, for advice, was a remarkable one. The large district round the great city Isaura had fallen into utter disorganization (probably owing to the unruly character of the Isaurians, who were frequently in rebellion). Several bishops were needed for the care of so large a district. Basil would prefer that a bishop for the city should first be appointed, who might

of *Asia Minor*, p. 286; see also Sir C. Wilson's *Handbook to Asia Minor*, etc. (Murray), p. 169. The modern village of Gelvere is built in the Tiberina, described by Gregory Naz., *Ep.* 6, 7, a narrow, rocky, picturesque glen, like a hole in the plain (4,500 feet above sea level), "the very pit of the whole earth," as Basil calls it (*Ep.* 14).

¹ εἰς πλεονας ἐπισκόπους καταδιαιρεθῆναι τὴν μέμνην.

afterwards associate others with himself, as his experience showed him that they might be most usefully placed. But, owing to the danger that the bishop might be tempted by ambition to rule over a larger diocese, and might not consent to the ordination of others, he felt it safer to appoint in the first place bishops (*προϊσταμένους*) to the small towns or villages which were formerly the seats of bishops, and thereafter to select the bishop of the city. We have here a good example of the decay of bishoprics in political troubles, of the revival of disused bishoprics, and of the trouble that might be caused by an ambitious prelate.

Some other examples have struck me where opinions as to the meaning are likely to differ. But when we consider how little care has been devoted to the elucidation of Basil, and contrast it with the voluminous studies that have contributed to the long and difficult growth of the interpretation of Horace, or Virgil, or Sophocles, we can better appreciate the difficulties that Mr. Jackson had to face, and better estimate the gratitude we owe him.

W. M. RAMSAY.

CÆSAR AND GOD.

MARK xii. 13-17.

THE last days of Jesus were distinguished by the persistence and subtlety with which His enemies sought to "catch Him in talk." Their first attempt, in which they challenged the authority by which He acted as He did, was not only foiled, but retorted; they, and not He, were put to shame by the result (ch. xii. 27-32). But they soon returned to the charge, and the forces which they combined against Him—Pharisees and Herodians—show how various and how profound were the antipathies he had evoked. The Pharisees were fanatics in religion, and extreme

nationalists, almost revolutionists in politics; they professed a devotion to God that knew no limits, and a hatred of Rome as intense: the first of these passions seemed to them to involve the other. The Herodians, on the other hand, were a species of opportunists. They too were nationalists, of a kind; but so long as a Herod was on the throne in Galilee or Judæa, though he was only a titular sovereign, and not even a Jew by birth, they would not raise trouble with Rome. Still, as representing national independence, even in a modified form, they could join with the Pharisees in laying a politico-religious trap for Jesus. One only wonders whether the combination did not strike themselves as suspicious. It was unusual enough to put Jesus on His guard.

The last embassy had approached Him with a challenge; this one came with an ostentation of deference. "Master, we know that Thou art true, and carest not for any man, for Thou regardest not the person of men, but of a truth teachest the way of God." It was true, but for true men it was much overdone. Jesus could not be intimidated or overawed—this they saw clearly; but their elaborate profession of reverence for His character betrays the hope that possibly He may be flattered into some unguarded or compromising speech, and so put Himself in their power. Their *captatio benevolentiae* is meant to invite His confidence, to encourage Him to speak without reserve; and when He does so, they are ready to make the most unscrupulous use of anything He says. But all the while they are only exposing their duplicity to the searching eye of Jesus. No formal courtesy, however elaborate, can hide from Him the malignity of the heart. And it is so with all truly good men. The cynicism about the accessibility of all men to flattery is not ultimately true; the flatterer is seen through far oftener than he imagines, and of all objects of contempt he is the most legitimate.

The flattering preamble is followed by a plain question : Is it lawful to give tribute to Cæsar or not? Shall we give or shall we not give? The tribute in question was a poll tax : Westcott and Hort have ἐπικεφάλαιον in their margin as an alternative reading to κῆνσον. It was not the amount that was serious, but the principle. The case that was presented to Jesus was a case of conscience : is it lawful? A modern reader can hardly help wondering how such a question could rise, but it rose directly enough from principles current among the Jews, and especially among the Pharisees. They conceived themselves as constituting a divine kingdom, in which God alone was King. Loyalty to Him, they argued, excludes recognition of any other sovereign power. We ought to die first, as Judas the Galilæan and his followers died, rather than compromise our allegiance to our Divine King by paying taxes which acknowledge the rights of another. But all were not so scrupulous, even in theory. Most people recognised the will of God in some sense in accomplished facts, and paid their poll tax without thinking too much about it, because there was no alternative. Perhaps in an ideal state Israel would be independent of Rome, if not its sovereign, but they took the world as they found it, and had no idea of hurling themselves against the legions. Hence the division of opinion.

Interpreters have differed as to the answer His enemies expected from Jesus. Probably they did not know what to expect ; but while they were prepared to make use of either Yes or No, it seems clear that they invited No rather than Yes. The flattery of His courage and sincerity suggests that they are drawing Him on to say some daring thing, and the daring thing would have been to declare that the payment of tribute to Rome was unlawful : that would have put Him in Pilate's power at once. Besides, Jesus was a Galilæan, pious, a friend of the people, constantly teaching

about the kingdom of God, and identified in some way with the Messianic hope which seemed to the Jews the direct antithesis of any national dependence; the people who questioned Him too, all nationalists themselves, might be supposed to suggest the negative answer as most in accordance with their sympathies, however they might subsequently use it; and for all these reasons it seems pretty obvious that they were trying to make Him say No. But even if He said Yes, it is lawful, they would gain something. They could use that unpatriotic reply to shake His credit with the people. The question was a proper one to ensnare Him, because, whichever way He answered, it would damage Him and advantage His adversaries.

He answered with perfect simplicity, without evasion, yet in a way which at once foiled his questioners, and brought men of narrow and perplexed minds into a large room. With one word of censure on their hypocrisy, and mean attempt to compromise Him, He said, Bring Me a denarius that I may see it. The small silver coin was brought with the Emperor's likeness upon it, surrounded by his name and the magnificent titles of the great magistracies which he engrossed in his person. Like the rupee in India bearing the Queen's head, that was decisive. Cæsar was in point of fact their sovereign. They took his money, and they must give it back (*ἀπόδοτε*, v. 17, not *δότε*). The circulation of it meant that they enjoyed all the advantages of a settled administration under him, and of course they must pay for them. But to do so does not interfere in the least with perfect loyalty to God and His kingdom. Jesus felt that the question of His tempters proceeded on the assumption (which a negative answer might be held to justify) that there was an irreconcilable antagonism between the two things. Is it to be Cæsar or God? that was the real question in their minds. But the answer of Jesus is, It is to be Cæsar and God. He knew in His own

experience—for here, as in many of His most wonderful words, it is His own experience to which we are introduced—that there was no such conflict of duties before the most pious Israelite. He Himself combined, and had no difficulty in combining, absolute loyalty to the kingdom of God with a free recognition of the existing political situation. He had proved by the decisive experiment of His life that there was no necessary contradiction between the two. We may suppose, if we please, that His answer was in a manner distributed between his questioners. Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's—so much is specially appropriate to the fanatic nationalism of the Pharisees; and to God the things that are God's—so much is to be specially taken to heart by the worldly-minded Herodians. But to distribute it thus tends to obscure the principal point: that man's civil and religious duties, what he owes to the earthly government under which he lives and what he owes to the kingdom of God, are alike obligatory, and that there is no natural nor necessary antagonism between them.

It is from the plain broad meaning of this answer of Jesus that we must start in any attempt to apply it to other times and circumstances. That meaning unmistakably is, that God is not the rival of any earthly king, and that the kingdom of God is not one which enters into competition with the kingdoms of this world upon their own ground. When such rivalry or competition emerges, there is misconception somewhere, which needs to be corrected by a return to the words of Christ. He teaches unequivocally that loyalty to the kingdom of God is quite compatible with loyalty to an earthly kingdom. He teaches not only that a man may be, but that he ought to be, a good citizen and a good Christian at the same time. And it does not matter, in principle, what the constitution of the earthly state may be. Under a republic or under a

monarchy, as the member of an imperial or of a subject nation, as bond or free, a man must both discharge the duties of his civil place, and loyally serve God in His kingdom.

It is a strange fortune that has made this word of Jesus play so great a part in the controversies as to the relation between Church and State. To divide life between two unrelated authorities, which have nothing to do with each other, was clearly not His intention. Just as little can we assume that Cæsar and God can be satisfactorily translated, under all conditions, by State and Church. Probably no words in the Bible can simply be lifted in this way, and made to yield mechanical answers to ethical questions. It is misleading, too, if we insist upon a distinction as the main thing in the answer of Jesus, when the main thing really is a compatibility, a joint obligation, of civil and religious duties. But it is certain, nevertheless, that many of the perplexities which have arisen in the relations of Church and State, and many of the conflicts which have agitated both society and the individual conscience, have been due to ignoring something which the words of Jesus suggest. Mistaken ideas as to the nature of God's kingdom, and the demands made upon man by loyalty to it, have constantly appeared in history, and are still widely prevalent; and when the kingdom of God is identified, as it is sure to be to a greater or less extent, with the church or churches which are its peculiar organs, the very situation is created out of which the difficulties of the Jewish zealots emerged. In two cases conspicuously the lesson of our Lord's words is missed.

It is missed in the most glaring way by the Church of Rome. In that communion the visible Church and all that makes its visibility are treated as one with the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God is as much visible and palpable as the kingdom of Italy. There was a time when

the earthly sovereignty of the Church was more lavishly asserted than it is now: when claims were made to all sorts of state functions, and especially to the right of exempting church officials from trial by civil courts even for offences against society, such as fraud, violence, or murder. Exemption from taxation was a small matter in comparison with this. The claim that is still made for a temporal sovereignty of the Pope as essential to his position as head of the Church is the same in kind. It means at bottom that for the Pope to pay taxes to King Humbert is an act of disloyalty to God. But Christ Himself says, No. The kingdom of God is not as one of the kingdoms of this world. It is too great to come into collision with the kingdom of Italy at that point. It is misconceived by any one who thinks otherwise. It is misconceived by the Pope if he imagines that he cannot be a loyal subject of the King of Italy, and at the same time render to God what is God's. But the Pope's Church, which to him is the kingdom of God, is in principle a State, a worldly kingdom, affecting to deal with the kingdoms of this world as they deal with each other. As such it has completely missed the teaching of Jesus in this scene with the Pharisees and Herodians. It is in its inmost nature disloyal, at once to the grandeur in which Christ sets forth His kingdom, and to the earthly States with which it treats: it makes rivalry inevitable where Jesus says it should be impossible. It is the enemy both of true citizenship and of true Christianity.

And the lesson of our Lord's words is missed in another way, at the opposite extreme of thought. Perhaps this is best represented by a school which has had a wide influence in England. Its favourite conception is that the Church is the nation in its religious aspect. As an institution, the Church is the national organ for the religious function of the national life, and every English citizen is *ipso facto* a member of the English Church. This conception has

enjoyed great political favour, and is apparently that which is recognised by the law. Its leading representatives have been men with a broad human interest in the various life of the nation, and a noble longing to see it under the consecration of religion. They have been Christian statesmen, humanists, socialists, who found their vocation in trying to leaven the mass and wealth of national life with Christianity, and could not see what else the Gospel existed for. As far as the nation is concerned, it may not exist for anything else. But the Gospel does not exist solely for the nation; and to fuse the Church, which is the organ of the Gospel, in the nation, is to create a situation in which the Gospel—or in other words, the kingdom of God, of which Jesus speaks—inevitably fails to get its due. It is perhaps possible enough in this situation to render to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's; but whenever the religious consciousness is quickened, it is found difficult and ultimately impossible to render to God that which is God's. The conception works fairly well in sleepy Herodian times, or in the hands of latitudinarian men, but a revival immediately strains it. It was strained in last century by Wesleyanism, when thousands of men, loyally rendering to the State all that was its due, were obliged to cut themselves off from the State religion, that they might render to God *His* due. If Christ's conception of the relation between the kingdom of God and earthly kingdoms had then been represented in the civil and religious life of England, no such divorce would have been necessary, for there would have been no such bonds to break. In the same way this conception has been strained, and is being strained at this moment, by the consequences of the Tractarian revival. The heirs of the Oxford movement, men like Canon Gore and the late Canon Liddon, full of religious earnestness, have been compelled to feel that the national mould is unequal to the life, the duty, and the vocation of the New Testament Church:

Under present conditions, it has been frankly avowed, loyal Christians—loyal, I mean, to the kingdom of God—have found it impracticable to do what their loyalty demands. Within the limitations which its fusion with the State imposes the Church cannot assert its spirituality, its catholicity, its own conceptions, derived from the New Testament, of life and duty ; it cannot exercise any effective discipline in its care of souls ; it cannot insist upon anything like the New Testament standard of conduct among its members. No one has yet expressed, with the frank boldness of Lacordaire, his abhorrence of that monstrosity, that contradiction in terms, a national Church ; but the experiences referred to are all working towards the dissolution of that conception on which the existence of national churches depends. There is a union in the minds of many good men of political apprehensiveness, with spiritual willingness that the old relation should cease, and give room for the free life of the Church. I do not think it is open to doubt that the movement in this direction is a movement toward the ideas of our Lord ; and that only when it is consummated will it be possible to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, *and* to God the things that are God's. Justice can be done to both only when they are related in the lives of all men as they were in the life and experience of Jesus Himself.

J. DENNEY.

CONCORDANCES TO THE OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK.

As the Concordance at present in course of publication by the Clarendon Press, at Oxford, approaches its completion, it is interesting to look back and see what has been done in this field of labour before.

The first to undertake any work of the kind was Conrad

Kircher. He was a Lutheran theologian, who was born at Augsburg, and died about the year 1622, having been pastor at Raub, about half-way between Vienna and Buda-Pesth, at Sonnenberg, Donauwerth in Bavaria, and Jaxthausen. His great undertaking was published at Frankfort in 1607, and is entitled “*Concordantiae Veteris Testamenti Graecae Ebraeis vocibus respondentēs πολύχρηστοι. . . . authore Conrado Kirchero, Augustano.*”

It is really a Hebrew Concordance giving the Greek equivalents to each Hebrew word. He gives first each Hebrew word—these are arranged under their roots—then a translation or explanation in Latin of the Hebrew, then each Greek corresponding word, with a Latin equivalent, arranged in no very definite order with the passages in which each occurs under it, and an occasional quotation from the Hexapla. Each column is numbered separately, and there is no separate paging of the work. Sometimes the Greek words seem to be given in the order of their first occurrence in the LXX. In the Hebrew the order is not strictly alphabetical, and the Hebrew conjugations of the verbs are not mentioned except in special cases, *e.g.*, מִשְׁפָּחָה = ἐραστής. Kircher corrects in one case a fault in the alphabetical order in a somewhat quaint way. The word לֵאָה happens to be inserted out of its place, so we find this note in the body of the work.

“N.B.—Hoc (quantum sequitur sub לֵאָה) poni debuit post מִשְׁפָּחָה pag. 285. Id sero adversum operis ne sit. fraudi rogamus.”

And when we reach p. 285, we find a note,—

“Huc refer לֵאָה quod supra est fol. 176 usque 181. Id ut supra notavimus haud tempori fuit deprehensum; sed jam computatis paginis partim excusis.”

The headings of the columns are very carelessly done; *e.g.*, in the middle of the article מִשְׁפָּחָה two columns are headed מִשְׁפָּחָה. The same word occasionally occurs twice, *e.g.*,

מֵאִירוֹת is given under the root אִנָּה, and also under the root אָרָה. Some of these mistakes may perhaps be considered to be the printer's errors, though Kircher says his work was read over for him by G. Jungermann. He occasionally points out what he considers may be of value to those who use his work, *e.g.*, that γειώρας = Chald. גִּיּוֹרָא. As a rule he takes no notice of transliterated words, though some find a place, *e.g.*, ἀλληλουϊα, θεέ (ΣΤ).

Very occasionally a proper name is inserted. At the end of the Hebrew Concordance an index of the Greek words is given with references to each column in the Concordance where it is to be found, with quotations from the apocryphal books—not including 3, 4 Maccabees—inserted in their proper places; but in this part of the work he gives no translation of the Greek. But when all is said, the work must be held to have been a great triumph of industry. Prepared originally for private use, during seven years' incessant labour, and in its first form only a catalogue of references, the Greek was afterwards inserted when publication was determined upon.

It is quite clear that Kircher estimated very highly the value of the study of the LXX., for fifteen years after the publication of his Concordance he published a work of which the title is "De Concordantiarum Biblicarum maxime Veteris Testamenti Graecarum Ebraeis vocibus respondentium vario ac multiplici in Sacrosancta Theologia usu plana ac perspicua ἀνάπτυξις," and although some of his reasons for the value of such a Concordance may appear of little weight now, he certainly did excellent work in directing men's attention to the LXX.

Kircher's Concordance held the field for more than a hundred years, though it was felt that it was not a very convenient work to use. It was not based upon the best editions of the LXX.; it had in it many inaccuracies, and, in consequence of its arrangement, it was a troublesome

work to use if all the occurrences of a Greek word were to be investigated. Sooner or later there was bound to be a Concordance which should really be a Greek Concordance. Some went so far as to consider that it was almost a fraud that such a work as Kircher's should be called a Greek Concordance at all. More than one attempt was made to compile a work that should be more useful than Kircher's. Sir Henry Savile compiled, or, if he did not actually do the work himself, caused to be compiled, a Concordance. It was a mere work of scissors and paste for the greater part. Two copies of Kircher were cut up and distributed in alphabetical order according to the Greek words, and the Hebrew equivalents were inserted either in MS. or from the headings of Kircher's articles. He makes very much the same kind of omissions that Trommius does, *e.g.*, of paraphrastic renderings. His work still exists in the Bodleian Library, at Oxford (press-mark, Auct. E. I. 2, 3). A specimen was printed and published by the University Press in 1714 under the superintendence of Gagnier, of whom we shall hear later. Hearne (iii. 76, Doble's ed.) seems doubtful whether the work was done by Sir H. Savile. The difficulty appears to be that though Gagnier ascribes the work to Savile, he assigns it to a time when Savile had been long dead. Other attempts of a similar kind appear to have been made, but they were all based upon Kircher. A Concordance to the LXX. following the Greek order of the words by Dr. Ambrose Aungier, Chancellor of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, which was completed in 1647, is still in existence in manuscript in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. It seems in many parts to be an abridged transcript of Kircher.¹ At length the wished-for book appeared in 1718. It was the work of Trommius.

Abraham van der Trommen, or Tromm, or Trommius,

¹ I am indebted for this information to the kindness of Dr. Bernard, of Trinity College, Dublin.

as he generally called himself, was a Protestant theologian who was born at Groningen, in Holland, about 1633 and died in 1719, after having been pastor at Haren and then at Groningen. He was married four times, and was a pupil of the second Buxtorf, a famous Hebraist, at Bale, from whom he quoted the Latin version he gives of the Hebrew and Chaldee words in his Concordance. His Concordance was published at Amsterdam, in 1718; and though he disclaims anything of the kind, yet he treats the work of Kircher, his predecessor, with considerable disdain. Even on his title-page he must needs say "*contra atque in opere Kircheriano factum fuerat.*" He had previously compiled a Flemish Concordance to the Bible, and therefore gained some experience in this kind of work before attempting his *magnum opus*. In his preface he points out what he considers to be the leading faults of Kircher's Concordance. (1) It was really a Hebrew Concordance, not a Greek one. (2) It contains many misquotations. This, as we have seen, was probably due to the fact that at first Kircher only put down the references and afterwards inserted the quotations. (3) He complains that the Hebrew words are in confusion, through Kircher's attempt to follow the order of the Hebrew roots. No doubt in this Kircher was the more scientific of the two. While Kircher had based his Concordance on the Bale edition of 1550, which was copied from the Aldine edition, Trommius followed that published at Frankfort in 1597, and an edition of the Vatican text published in London in 1653.

Trommius gives many more quotations from the Hexapla than Kircher did. He does not quote the transliterated words, and omits passages which are paraphrastic or do not give the meaning of the Hebrew. Proper names are, as a rule, omitted, and both Concordances omit indeclinable words and pronouns. The apocryphal quotations are by no means complete. A certain number of passages

are given by both compilers, derived from scholia and other sources, but not actually to be found in the present text of the LXX. These are marked with a § by Trommius.

Though the book is by no means perfect, it is in some respects an advance upon Kircher. Trommius generally notices the Hebrew conjugations and also inserts conjectures as to what the Hebrew reading of the LXX. was. But the work is disfigured by a considerable number of misprints and misplacements of passages in succession. This was probably due to a slip of the MS. being misplaced, as we gather from these mistakes that each slip contained about six or seven lines of MS. Curious mistakes occur sometimes; *e.g.* *εἰργον*, in what is now quoted as I. Es. 5, 69 (72), is taken as “*pro ἔργον*.” There are, of course, no quotations from the LXX. version of Daniel, as represented by the Codex Chisianus, for that was not edited till 1722. So far as a rough calculation can settle the point, there would seem to be four quotations in Trommius for every three in Kircher.

The Concordance, properly so called, is followed by a Hebrew and Chaldee Index, arranged alphabetically and not by roots as in Kircher. This is followed by Montfaucon's Lexicon to the Hexapla, and a collation of the Frankfort and Vatican editions as to the numeration of chapters and verses by that well-known LXX. scholar, Lambert Bos.

Trommius must have been eighty-four years of age when his Concordance was published, and he followed it up by a short *Epistola Apologetica* for his work, which the present writer has been unable to meet with in any of the libraries he has consulted.¹

Trommius had so openly challenged the method of

¹ Neither has he seen a copy of Gagnier's specimen, printed at the Clarendon Press.

Kircher in his Concordance that those who had valued the labour and methods of the older Concordance felt that they must take up the cudgels in behalf of the older work. Oxford was the *locale* of the defence of Kircher. At the time of the publication of Trommius' Concordance there was living in Oxford an Oriental scholar of some fame named Jean Gagnier. He was born in Paris about 1670, and migrated from Paris to England, where he placed himself first of all under the patronage of the Bishop of Worcester. He joined the English Church, and was appointed, in 1717, to act as substitute for Professor Wallis.¹ The eighteenth century saw much done for the study of the LXX. and other Greek versions. We have but to mention the names of Hody (d. 1707), Grabe (d. 1711), Bos (d. 1717), Montfaucon (d. 1741), Biel (d. 1745), and Breitinger (d. 1776),² to prove this, and therefore much attention was directed to their works as they came out. Gagnier undertook the defence of Kircher and published at Oxford his work, of which the following is the title: "Vindiciae Kircherianae sive Animadversiones in Novas Abrahami Trommii Concordantias Graecas Versionis vulgo dictae LXX. Interpretum. . . . Oxonii e Theatro Sheldoniano A.D. 1718."

It was published in the very same year that Trommius' Concordance saw the light, and is a laboured defence of Kircher and an attack upon Trommius. Gagnier almost seems to imply that Trommius did little else but piece together Kircher's Concordance cut up into slips to suit his own ideas as to the arrangement of a Concordance. This, at any rate, is what seems to have been done with a view to publication by Savile, and, as Gagnier was contemplating the publication of a Concordance on his own

¹ Doble's edition of *Hearne's Collections*, vol. i. p. 368.

² The first volume of the edition of Holmes and Parsons was published in 1795.

account, his wrath may have been deeply stirred at feeling that such a publication was scarcely required for the present. At any rate, many thought, as we can gather from letters still in existence (Ballard MSS. in the Bodleian Library), that Gagnier had transgressed all the bounds of moderation in his *Vindiciae*, and the dispute about the rival merits of the two Concordances died away.

No other Concordance to the LXX. seems to have seen the light for nearly 170 years. In 1887 there was published "A Handy Concordance to the LXX., giving various readings from Codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus and Ephraemi with an Appendix of Words from Origen's Hexapla, etc., not found in the above MSS. (Bagster)." The preface is signed G.M., and dated 1887. Pronouns and prepositions are omitted. It contains no proper names. No Hebrew equivalents are given except under *θεός* and *κύριος*, and then they are given in English characters. No references to the Apocrypha are inserted. In some of the longer and commoner words only references are given to passages where there is a various reading. The various readings are given at the foot of each article. The Appendix also contains words from the twelve Uncials of Holmes and Parsons, but "no attempt has been made to give *all* the references where a word occurs." It is impossible in any satisfactory way to compare the number of entries with that in previous Concordances. It is an extremely useful and handy book as far as it goes, but something more is still felt to be desired in the way of a complete setting forth of the Hebrew equivalents and of Hexaplaric references, and also of the Greek of the Apocrypha. Trommius had done this as far as he could, but he had no critical apparatus before him of the actual readings of A and B, to say nothing of any other MSS., and *Σ* was not discovered till long after his time. How far this want is being supplied by the Concordance now

being published¹—the first part saw the light in 1892—it is not for the present writer to determine. Neither has he included in the present article any notice of the Lexicons to the Greek Old Testament of Biel and Schleusner, or of such works as Rosenerch's Vocabulary of the LXX., published as a Lexicon in 1624.

HENRY A. REDPATH.

A FORGOTTEN KINGDOM IN A PROPHECY OF BALAAM.

IT is not often that a conjectural emendation is of so much interest to the historical student as one proposed by Prof. D. H. Müller, of Vienna,² an article from whose pen on the recent discoveries at Senjirli appeared in the *Contemporary Review* for April, 1894. It relates to a much disputed passage at the end of the section on Balaam (Num. xxiv. 23, 24), which some have explained by the light of 1 Maccabees i. 1 (cf. viii. 5) as pointing to the Macedonian invasion of Asia, or even (see the Targums, and cf. Dan. xi. 30) to a still later time.

That "ships from Cyprus," which was tributary to Sargon, should be described as able to "afflict Asshur" and to "afflict Eber" was certainly strange, and the passages in 1 Maccabees and in Daniel are irresistibly suggestive.

Hence long ago Leibnitz wrote thus: "Il y a un bel endroit dans la dernière prophétie de Bileam à la fin qui pourroit faire croire qu'il avoit été poussé quelques fois par l'Esprit de Dieu. C'est qu'il paroît avoir prédit la venue d'Alexandre le grand dans l'orient, et le renversement de

¹ *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament* (including the Apocryphal Books), by the late Edwin Hatch, M.A., D.D., and Henry A. Redpath, M.A., assisted by other scholars (Oxford).

² See his *Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form* (Wien, 1895), i. 215, 216.

l'Empire qui étoit possédé auparavant par les Assyriens et par les Perses. Car il dit, supposé que c'est lui qui a parlé, qu'un jour des vaisseaux viendroient de Chittim, c'est à dire de la Grèce, et non pas l'Italie (comme quelques uns l'ont pris en l'appliquant aus Romains), et que ces nouveaux venus détruiroient l'Assur et l'Heber. Car Assur signifie les Assyriens, et Heber plusieurs peuples de tous les fils d'Heber. Car pour marquer que c'est d'Alexandre qu'on veut parler, on ajoute que le chef de ceus à Chittim, après avoir bouleversé l'orient, perira bien tôt lui même."

Delitzsch, to whom I owe this quotation, accepts this theory.¹ So also does Cornill (*Einleitung*, p. 86), who finds a literary fiction in the supposed prediction, and holds, on critical grounds derived from other sources, that the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch received additions even later than the date of the Septuagint version. But such a view is not to be adopted without strong necessity, and, as Dillmann remarks, not only do the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint contain the passage, but Daniel xi. 30 appears to allude to Numbers xxiv. 24. To this it can now be added that in all probability the received text is incorrect. Prof. Sayce, who is so displeased at the "rashness" of the higher criticism, but who is himself so rash a critic, adopts² an old Jewish reading (or fancy) mentioned and approved by Geiger (*Urschrift*, p. 267), viz. מִשְׁכּוֹ אֵל for מִשְׁכּוֹיָאֵל, and a modification of the introduction prepared by the Septuagint (also put forward by Geiger), and renders, "And when he saw Agag (taking אֵי to be a corruption of אַגַּג), he took up his parable, and said, Who will outlive Samuel?" And in v. 24 he emends וַיִּצְאֵם into וַיִּצְאֵם (with Sept.), and מִירוּשָׁלַיִם into מִיַּד כְּתִים. But all this is highly uncritical from the point of view of ordinary Hebraists, though in a newly-found inscription it

¹ *Zeitschrift für kirchliche Wissenschaft*, 1888, p. 119 ff.

² "Balaam's Prophecy and the God Sheth," *Hebraica*, October, 1887.

might perhaps have a provisional value. Prof. D. H. Müller has, it appears to me, found a much better solution of the textual problem, and it is both a brilliant and an easy one. The Septuagint's prefix, *καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν ἌΓ* (but Lucian has *Γῶγ*, *i.e.* Agag) may be, and doubtless is, a pure guess,—for of course the name of some neighbouring people is to be expected,—but a prefix there must originally have been at the head of the third as well as at the opening of the first and second oracles; and if שְׁמוּאֵל (combining שָׁמוּ and אֵל)¹ were only the name of a people, we might confidently restore the words “And he saw Shemuel” before “and he took up his parable, and said.” Now Prof. D. H. Müller thinks that שְׁמוּאֵל should rather be שְׁמָאֵל, and that we have here the only Biblical reference to the kingdom of Sham'al in north-west Syria, mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions, and now better known to us through the wonderful discoveries at the Tell of Senjirli. After this Prof. Müller has but one small correction to make: וְעָנִי must be read twice in *v.* 24 for וְעָנִי. How simple! and yet, though Sham'al has long been known to have existed in the Assyrian period, no one made this conjecture before this highly trained student of Semitic inscriptions. “That the Assyrians and dwellers on the other side of the Euphrates ‘afflicted’ and ‘destroyed’ the kingdom of Sham'al, is a historical fact. Not less probable is it that a fleet from Cyprus landed at Alexandretta and undertook a plundering expedition to Sham'al.” The critic adds, whether seriously or by a kindly consideration for a large section of his readers, I cannot tell, “The kingdom of Sham'al must, being situated not far from Balaam's native place, have been well known to him.” At any rate, it was well known to Hebrew writers in the Assyrian period of Israelitish history.

¹ That שְׁמוּאֵל is wrong ought surely to be clear to every thoughtful student.

The last of the three little oracles ascribed to the seer of Pethor will now read as follows :

[And he saw Sham'al], and began his oracle, and said,
Alas ! who will survive of Sham'al ?
And there shall be ships from the coast of Cyprus,
And Assyria shall afflict him, and Eber shall afflict him,
And he too (shall come) to destruction.

T. K. CHEYNE.

“*ST. PAUL THE TRAVELLER.*”

PROF. RAMSAY'S new book¹ and the commentary of Dr. Blass, taken together, mark an epoch in the study of the Acts. Once more it has become possible to approach the literature on that book without a feeling of utter weariness. For some years past it had seemed as though the criticism of the Acts was doomed to waste itself among the sands of sterile hypothesis. It all moved along a single channel, and that a channel which led nowhere. Because literary analysis has won its triumphs in the Old Testament, and because it was employed at least hopefully in the case of the Synoptic Gospels, it was assumed that it could be applied without further qualification, and it was applied with interminable hair-splitting, to the Acts. The first condition of successful literary analysis must be the existence of clearly marked differences of style and of ideas. But in regard to the Acts the differences of style throughout the book were less marked than the identity; and though it was often assumed, it was never proved that such peculiarities as existed in idea and mode of treatment were inconsistent with substantial unity of authorship. I am not concerned to deny the existence of sources—even written sources—in the Acts, but the attempts to discriminate them so far have ended only in failure; the various reconstructions have been each more artificial than the last; and, in fact, hardly a single step in the process has been made good to the satisfaction of any one beyond the critic by whom it was put forward.²

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen.* (Hodder and Stoughton.)

² I find myself in much agreement with the estimate of recent criticism of

The fundamental mistake has been that the critics—in different degrees and with proportionate degrees of ill-success—have approached the Acts in a spirit of suspicion. Here they have seen redaction in one sense, there they have seen redaction in another; the one hypothesis which they have often seemed least willing to entertain is that the author of the Acts meant what he said and had good reasons for saying it.

In this lies the significance, and, as I cannot but think, the conspicuous superiority of the methods pursued by Dr. Blass and Prof. Ramsay. They have begun by taking their author as he stands. They have approached him with the presumption that he was right and not wrong. They have looked hard at what he said and weighed thoroughly all the surrounding circumstances before they have had recourse to theories of redaction, interested statement, or fiction. In addition to this they have had advantages shared by none of their more recent predecessors. Dr. Blass has had a long training in the severe school of classical philology, and in consequence he has given us a commentary which is before all things the work of a scholar—clear, concise, hitting off the main point in the fewest possible words, and supporting the interpretation adopted by well-selected parallels. I do not by any means always agree with him. I am convinced that the Acts was written after and not before 70 A.D., and I greatly doubt the theory of two recensions of the text both issued by St. Luke himself. But opinions are always less important than the presentation of the *data*, and it is for the presentation of these that Dr. Blass has earned our profound gratitude. His book will remain the commentary on the Acts for many a long day.

the Acts by Dr. O. Zöckler (*Greifswalder Studien*, p. 109 ff.). I differ from him chiefly in the extent to which I am able to accept the textual theories of Dr. Blass. He adopts them *en bloc*.

Prof. Ramsay has much in common with Dr. Blass. He too comes to his subject from the side of classical philology, but it is classical philology in its broadest sense, an intimate knowledge of ancient life. The one man whom he calls master is Mommsen,¹ and like Mommsen he brings to bear on the interpretation of his text a mastery, which is every day becoming more complete, of that which lies behind the text, the framework of the Roman Empire, the deeper roots of ancient civilization. Add to this familiarity with the actual soil which St. Paul trod, the actual roads by which he travelled, the actual sites of the cities in which he stayed; and add again a singular faculty for going to the heart of a problem, vigorous powers of reasoning, and a nervous, masculine style, and I think it will be agreed that Prof. Ramsay brings to his task a very exceptional equipment.

Nothing could be easier than to illustrate this from the volume before us. It simply bristles with points of interest. There is not a page of it from the first to the last that is not fresh, independent, original, grappling with his subject at first hand. The writer's gifts perhaps sometimes disturb the balance of his judgment. He sees his own points so vividly, they stand out from the canvas so boldly, that he cannot see anything besides. The considerations which weigh with others seem to him trivial by comparison. Sometimes, perhaps, they are trivial, but not, I think, always. There are times when I should be tempted myself to put in a plea for arrest of judgment where the case is stated so powerfully as almost to overbear opposition. I propose to give an instance presently. But this again rather enhances than detracts from my admiration for Prof. Ramsay's book. It is not infallible any more than Dr. Blass is infallible; but it shows an extraordinary

¹ A like phrase is also applied to Bishop Lightfoot (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 8).

faculty for bringing real questions to a real issue ; and that is the surest means of the advance of knowledge.

Necessities of time and space—the time at my own disposal and the amount of space available in a single number of *THE EXPOSITOR*—prevent me from going through the book, as I should like, point by point, and compel me to select a particular topic which seems most to need discussion. This topic shall be the one on which Prof. Ramsay's views depart most widely from those generally current. The view which has hitherto greatly preponderated is that the visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem described in Galatians ii. 1–10 was on the occasion of the Apostolic Council described in Acts xv. Prof. Ramsay denies this, and identifies it rather with the mission of Barnabas and Paul to convey to Jerusalem the alms collected at Antioch, of which mention is made in Acts xi. 30. This visit, Prof. Ramsay thinks, took place in the year 45, or more probably 46 ; the Apostolic Council he would place in 49 or 50. Between them would intervene the whole of the first missionary journey (Acts xiii., xiv.) and the founding of what Prof. Ramsay would call the Galatian Churches.

If this view holds good, it will no doubt greatly affect the chronology of the Acts, and not inconsiderably the chronology of the Epistles. For this I am quite prepared, if it shall be necessary. So far as I can see no question of principle is involved. I am ready to be converted to Prof. Ramsay's view if the balance of argument shall be found to lean that way ; but he has not as yet succeeded in converting me, and it seems well that a case should be stated on the other side. I do not deny for a moment that Prof. Ramsay's arguments are real arguments. The question only is whether they are decisive, and whether there are not real arguments to be set against them.

I will put in the forefront at once the one consideration which compels me (as at present advised) to adhere to the

older view ; and I will then try to weigh the minor arguments for and against the rival hypotheses.

The consideration which to me seems in the strictly Baconian sense " crucial " is that Galatians ii. 1-10 implies a stage in the controversy as to the terms of admission of Gentile converts which had certainly been reached by the date of Acts xv. but which had not been reached at the date of Acts xi. 30.

On the visit of Galatians ii. 1-10, the main point decided was the distinct spheres of labour of the Judæan Apostles, especially St. Peter, and St. Paul. " When they saw that I had been intrusted with the gospel of the Uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel of the Circumcision (for He that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles) ; and when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James, and Cephas, and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision " (Gal. ii. 7-9).

We cannot resist the conclusion that by this time there is a cleavage, a great and deep cleavage, in the Church : the Christians of Gentile origin are on one side, those of Jewish origin on the other. Already there lies behind a period of vigorous mission work, in which the efforts of St. Paul for the Gentiles had been conspicuously crowned by the Divine blessing. This the Judæan Apostles recognise, and they shake hands over the *fait accompli*. Henceforward they will keep for their own province the Jews, and they bid God-speed to St. Paul in the work that lies before him among the Gentiles.

Now this is exactly the state of things which we find in Acts xv. It is, I would venture to say, as clearly not the state of things which we find in Acts xi. 30. At that time the preliminary conditions for it did not exist.

The gospel had been preached to a few Gentiles, most probably all of them as yet in some degree of connexion with the synagogue; but no cleavage, no question of principle had as yet arisen. There is no watchword "Jew" and "Gentile," no antithesis of "Circumcision" and "Uncircumcision." Prof. Ramsay himself shows very skilfully how this antithesis arose in the course of the journey of Acts xiii., xiv., but on his theory that journey is still in the future. Hitherto there have been nothing but friendly relations between the Church at Antioch as a whole and the Church of Jerusalem as a whole. The visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem has for its object only to convey the gifts of the one Church to the other. If matters of larger moment had been at stake, I should expect, and from the opinions which he expresses I should have thought that Prof. Ramsay would expect, the historian to take some note of them.

I am aware that in the August EXPOSITOR he has given a different version of the events in question. I venture to place my version side by side with it, and I know that Prof. Ramsay himself will do it justice.

It seems to me, if I may say so, that Prof. Ramsay minimizes too much the amount of friction to which the passage in Galatians bears witness. When he writes, "This visit then belongs to a period before the question had actually come to the front; it was already imminent, but was not yet actually the subject of contention," I cannot recognise this as an adequate description. How, for instance, does it agree with this: "But not even Titus who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: and that because of the false brethren privily brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage:¹ to whom we gave place in the way of sub-

¹ Prof. Ramsay proposes here a rather different translation and punctuation.

jection, no, not for one hour; that the work of the gospel might continue with you"? Is there no contention there? And is there none in the impatient words that follow? "But from those who are reputed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth not man's person)—they, I say, who were of repute imparted nothing to me," etc. True, the Apostle goes on to say how they shook hands and agreed to go different ways. He was a warm-hearted and generous opponent, and ready enough to close a threatened breach. The tension does not seem to have been directly with the Judæan Apostles, but it is clear that their names had been thrown in his teeth. He stood his ground, and held it; but even as he writes the memory of the scene comes back to him, and something of the spirit of battle imparts itself to his pen.

Surely there are a number of striking coincidences between this narrative and that of Acts xv. The "false brethren privily brought in . . . to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus,"—what are they but the "certain men" who "came down from Judæa and taught the brethren, saying, Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved"? The conflict (or at least the beginnings of it) must have been at Antioch, because the liberty spied upon was that of the Pauline congregations. The accounts I believe to be independent, and the points of view are different, but the situation is essentially the same.

That there was an openly conducted controversy is proved also by the case of Titus. It is not merely that St. Paul is appealing to a precedent drawn from a time of peace in a time of war. "To whom we gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour." The Epistle echoes the war-note as well as the history.

Not only was there controversy on the two occasions, but the course of the controversy was the same. It had the

same subject: the Pauline gospel was concerned; and the question of circumcision was definitely raised. It had the same turning-point. In both cases the argument which carried the day was the appeal of St. Paul to the hand of God as seen in the success of his own missions (Acts xv. 3, 4, 12, 26=Gal. ii. 7-9). The issue was the same: the fraternizing of the leaders, and the framing of a concordat which left to both sides all the freedom which they needed.

Against all these marked coincidences, what is to be quoted for Acts xi. 30? The single point, "only they would that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do." Prof. Ramsay lays stress on the aorist ἐσπούδασα, and he makes it refer to the alms which Paul and Barnabas had just handed over. But the proof that it does this is anything but stringent. Prof. Ramsay points out the delicate courtesy of the Judæan Apostles in selecting for their one condition the very thing that had brought St. Paul to Jerusalem: "Make it your rule to do what you have been regularly doing." In any case the request is courteously and delicately put, because in any case St. Paul had given proof of his willingness to do what was required of him. But to me it seems distinctly more natural that such a request should be made at a moment when the answer to it was less glaringly obvious. To ask St. Paul to do what he had done before, is one thing; to ask him to do the very thing which he came for the purpose of doing, is another. Action such as that supposed would hardly mark a high sense of what was graceful and fitting.

I confess that to me the coincidences between Acts xv. and Galatians ii. come with great force—with all the more force because the differences which accompany them show that they are wholly undesigned. On these differences Prof. Ramsay would insist; and it is right that we should discuss them.

Before doing so I have one general criticism to make on Prof. Ramsay's book which may come in here as appropriately as anywhere. I am reluctant to make it, because the point to which it is directed is so very much the opposite of the treatment accorded to the Acts of late by most other scholars. And my own sympathies are far more with Prof. Ramsay than with them. I must in candour admit that his treatment of St. Luke as a historian seems to me too optimistic. Not but that I gladly and heartily join in his eulogies, but he seems to me not to allow enough for facts over which St. Luke himself had no control; that is to say, he does not allow enough for the limitations to which St. Luke was inevitably exposed from the nature of his sources.

He writes as if St. Luke had the whole of the facts fully spread out before him, and as if all that he had to do was to make a selection among them. Now I do not doubt that there is selection, and very skilful selection. Prof. Ramsay has brought out this in a way for which we have much reason to be grateful to him. But I conceive that the selection was made within narrower limits, and that it was more largely conditioned by the available information. Let us think of the historian for a moment as he girds himself for the task of writing the two works which have come down to us, as Prof. Ramsay and I believe (though all would not agree with us) about the years 75-80 A.D. I should not, speaking for myself, suppose that he had conceived the idea of chronicling the history of the infant church very much earlier. It would appear from the preface to the Gospel that St. Luke was set upon writing it by the existence of other narratives dealing with the subject. But I do not think that these narratives began to spring up copiously before the decade 60-70 A.D. I believe that St. Paul was dead when St. Luke definitely planned the composition of the Acts. I want something

more than selection to explain the historian's silences. I should find it hard to explain them if he had a first-rate authority always within reach. The materials used I take to be in part written (like the greater part of the sources of the Gospel, and very possibly the source of the early chapters of the Acts), in part oral collected chiefly during the two years that St. Paul was imprisoned at Cæsarea, in part his own recollections and notes—such as those which perhaps lie behind the "We-sections." It is one thing to suppose that St. Luke had directed attention to the events which passed around him, to those before as well as after his own actual discipleship. So much seems to be implied in the *παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν* of the preface. But it is another thing to assume that St. Luke began with the intention of writing a history, and that he accumulated materials deliberately in view of this intention all through his career. If that had been the case, it seems to me that the narrative of the Acts would have been different from what it is.

We cannot say when or where or how St. Luke met the particular informant from whom he derived the narrative contained in Acts xv. But it seems to me, as I read that chapter, that this informant, whoever he was, gave him a plain, straightforward, consistent story, which differs indeed from that in Galatians ii., but for the single reason that it is told from a wholly different point of view. The person in question was one of the crowd, who saw what other outside spectators saw, and filled up the gaps with what he was told by others in the same position as himself. It was matter of common hearsay that disputes had arisen at Antioch, that these disputes were due to the presence of strict-minded Jews from Jerusalem, that it was decided to appeal to headquarters, and that a formal meeting of the mother-church had been summoned, that at this meeting the leading actors spoke—not at once, but after much

discussion, which is expressly mentioned in Acts xv. 7—summing up the position, and finally ending with a resolution which was carried without open dissent.

This is all that any one standing in the crowd could be expected to see and know; it hangs together perfectly; and, so far as it goes, we may accept it without hesitation. How strongly contrasted with this are the circumstances under which St. Paul is writing to the Galatians! That his account of what happened takes the form of narrative at all is an accident: it is all subordinate to his own purpose, which is to prove the independence of his own teaching. Where St. Luke's informant speaks from common knowledge of facts that might be seen from without, he writes from within, from the innermost of inner circles, of things perhaps in part known only to himself and God.

So long as this is borne in mind there is not a detail that does not seem to me to fall easily and naturally into its place. We do not know at all what the "revelation" was which impelled St. Paul to take the action he did, or how it fits into the chain of events; but Prof. Ramsay, I think, presses this ignorance of ours quite unduly when he takes it as excluding the statements of Acts xv. 3.¹ When I say "unduly," I mean more than we can afford to do if we are to attempt to write the history of events for which the data are so scanty. The juxtaposition in Acts xiii. 2, 3, of Divine prompting with formal commission seems to me sufficiently parallel. Commission seems implied in the laying on of hands, if not in ἀπέλυσας.

In like manner as to the private intercourse which *Epist. Gal.* implies as going on concurrently with, or perhaps as leading up to, the great public meeting recorded in the Acts. Any one who is acquainted with affairs knows that vital controversies are not settled in public meetings. But indeed

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 155.

on this head I need only quote Prof. Ramsay's own language on page 57: "Another purpose is said in *Epist. Gal.* to have been achieved on this journey, but Paul immediately adds that this other purpose was carried out as a mere private piece of business, and implies thereby that it was not the primary or official purpose of the journey." If Prof. Ramsay can find room for the events of Galatians ii. 1-10 in Acts xi. 30, I may claim to find room for them as well in Acts xv., where they stand indeed in much nearer relation to the main subject.

Weigh in opposite scales the coincidences and the discrepancies in the two accounts, and in my judgment at least there is no doubt which will fall and which will rise.

Only one really serious difficulty seems to me to attend the identification of the incidents in Acts xv. and Galatians ii. That is the one on which in pursuance of his argument Prof. Ramsay naturally insists, that on this theory we identify a visit to Jerusalem which in Galatians is apparently the second, with one which in the Acts is quite indisputably the third. Is this too covered by the special purpose of the two writers? On the view which I am adopting that is the only outlet from the dilemma.

We have to remember that St. Paul in Galatians has nothing really to do with visits to Jerusalem. What he has to do with is the intercourse of St. Paul with the elder Apostles. And we observe that although it is true that the author of the Acts would certainly make the visit of his fifteenth chapter the third, he says nothing whatever which would make it the third occasion of intercourse with the other Apostles. Rather there is what may well be a significant silence in regard to them in the description of the second visit. What St. Luke says about this is compressed into a single verse: "And the disciples [at Antioch] . . . determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judæa: which also they did, sending it *to the elders* by the

hand of Barnabas and Saul" (Acts xi. 30). I take this as a compendious expression implying not that the Church at Antioch intended its contributions to be delivered to the elders, but that as a matter of fact it was so delivered. But if so, is it purely by accident that there is no mention here of "Apostles"? that whereas elsewhere "the Apostles and elders" are constantly bracketed together as though they formed a single body (Acts xv. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23, xvi. 4; cf. xxi. 18), in this one place the Apostles drop out and the elders stand close? Prof. Ramsay attaches value to the silence of the Acts, even where it extends only to a single word; and so do I attach value to it. I do not think that this marked omission of "the Apostles" was without a reason. Shall we speculate what reason?¹ I had been in the habit of supposing that this mission of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem synchronised with Herod's persecution in the year 44. The graphic picture of Acts xii. 12-17 shows that at this time the leading Apostles were in some sort of hiding. Now we note that the arrival of the two envoys is mentioned in chapter xi. 30, and their departure in chapter xii. 25; and between these two points comes the description of the Herodian persecution. So that the inference does not seem to be forced, that on this occasion the Apostles were not at hand, and the envoys from the Church at Antioch returned without having seen them.² On this hypothesis the various statements seem to dovetail neatly into each other. But in any case there is no direct contradiction between the language of the Acts and that of St. Paul on the assumption that the latter is referring to his third visit; and, that being so, I do not

¹ Prof. Ramsay explains the pointed mention of "elders" as due to a nice sense of the duties of different officials.

² Prof. Ramsay puts the visit in the year 45, or preferably 46. He thinks that the famine had begun, and that provisions were taken and not money. I believe it to be more probable that money was taken, on the faith of Agabus' prophecy, and that the Judæan Church was left to lay in stores for itself.

feel called upon to manufacture one where we know so little; the whole chapter of accidents is open.

For these reasons I still adhere to the older view, substantially as it was presented by Bishop Lightfoot. It seems to me that in this instance Prof. Ramsay has used the microscope which he has applied with such splendid effect elsewhere, but that he has turned one end of it towards certain of the arguments, and the other end towards others. Hence it is that he speaks with a confidence which the facts do not appear to me to warrant.

I am also inclined to go with Bishop Lightfoot in regard to the place which he assigns to the next section (Gal. ii. 11-14). Prof. Ramsay very ingeniously inserts the scene at Antioch in the series of events which led up to the council. According to him, it would correspond to Acts xv. 1, 2, a position which is rendered possible by throwing back the previous verses, Galatians ii. 1-10, to the latitude of Acts xi. 30. For us this ceases to be tenable, because we cannot invert the order of the two sections, or make the intercourse with St. Peter at Antioch precede what is expressly said to be the second occasion of intercourse with him at Jerusalem.

Thus the one conclusion carries with it the other, and for my own part I must be content to follow in the beaten track instead of taking the devious, but tempting paths opened up by Prof. Ramsay. Just this part of the book seems to me to miss the mark in its attempted reconstruction of the life of the Apostle. But even supposing that the verdict of others should go with me, it would detract but very little from the value of what is probably the freshest and most penetrating study ever made of that life in two of its aspects—"St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen."

W. SANDAY.

*JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK,
AND LUKE.*

II. THE REALISTIC PICTURE OF MARK.

THAT Mark is the earliest of the first three Gospels might be inferred from its comparative brevity, and also from the fact that it treats only of the public life of our Lord, giving no particulars concerning His birth such as we find in Matthew and Luke. But apart from these considerations this Gospel contains unmistakable internal marks of a relatively early date. These marks are such as suggest an eye and ear witness as the source of many narratives, and a narrator unembarrassed by reverence. This feeling, we know, does come into play in biographical delineations of men whose characters have become invested with sacredness, and its influence grows with time. The high esteem in which they are held more or less controls biographers, and begets a tendency to leave out humble facts, and tone down traits indicative of pronounced individuality, and so to construct a story smooth and commonplace in all that it reports of word or deed, and exhibiting a character free from all peculiarities over which the weakest might stumble, and just on that account devoid of interest for all who can discern and value originality and power. It may seem bold even to hint that any such influence can be traced in any of the evangelic memoirs. It would be contrary to fact to say that any of them exhibit the characteristics of biographical writing arising out of the sense of decorum in a highly developed form, though calm investigation may constrain the admission that the rudiments of these are to be found in one of them. What I am concerned at present to point out is, that wherever such characteristics may be discovered in the Gospels, they have no place in Mark's narratives. If, as we have already seen, the presentation of Jesus in the

first Gospel is influenced by prophecy going before, and if, as we shall see, the presentation of Jesus in the third Gospel is to a certain extent influenced by reverential faith coming after, it may be said with truth of the second that its picture of Jesus is not coloured by either of these influences.

Mark is the realist among the Evangelists. It has often been observed concerning his style that it is graphic, vivid, pictorial. The observation is not only not the whole truth, but it is even to some extent misleading. The epithet "pictorial" suggests the idea of an author who employs heightening phrases, and introduces unimportant particulars simply for effect. So used it is a doubtful compliment tending to lower rather than increase our respect for a writer. Now the thing to be noted about Mark is not the use of heightened or accumulated phrases so much as the avoidance of toning down, of reticence, of generalized expression, or of euphemistic circumlocution. He states facts as they were, when one might be tempted not to state them at all, or to show them in a subdued light. He describes from the life, while Matthew describes from the point of view of prophecy, and Luke from the view-point of faith. In this respect Mark occupies a place among the Gospels somewhat analogous to that of the Vatican codex,¹ which differs from all other ancient manuscript copies of the Greek New Testament by the measure in which it has kept free from modifications of the original due to regard for religious edification on the one hand, or to literary tastes on the other. The text of the Vatican codex has on this account been called "neutral," to distinguish it from the *paraphrasing* type of text current in the West, and from the *refining* type which had its source in Alexandria. Mark likewise may be called "neutral," not, indeed, in the sense in which the term has sometimes been applied to him, as implying a deliberate attitude of neutrality in reference to two conflict-

¹ Referred to in critical editions of the Greek New Testament by the letter B.

ing theological tendencies,¹ but in the sense that he reproduces the story of Jesus from the life, uninfluenced to any appreciable extent either by the prophetic interest of the first Evangelist, or by the delicate sense of decorum characteristic of the third.

In this neutrality of Mark we have a guarantee of first-hand reports and early redaction not to be despised. The realism of the second Gospel makes for its historicity. Therefore we may have the less hesitation in making this feature prominent by going somewhat into detail. I have tried to make an apologetic point of the occasional weakness of Matthew's prophetic references; I hope now to make an additional point by the exhibition of Mark's realistic delineations.

1. I begin with a biographic hint found only in this Gospel concerning the private life of Jesus previous to the commencement of His public career. It is contained in the question of His fellow-townsmen on the occasion of His visit to Nazareth, after He had for some time carried on His work elsewhere: Is not this the *Carpenter*?² This is the one fact we learn from the second Evangelist concerning the history of Jesus previous to the eventful day when He left Nazareth for the scene of the Baptist's ministry. Mark, unlike his brother Evangelists, has no account of Jesus' birth, and no genealogy proving Him to be a lineal descendant of David. "A son of the hero-king of Israel," say Matthew and Luke; "a carpenter," says Mark, with somewhat disenchanting effect. And yet Mark's solitary realistic contribution to the early history of Jesus is perhaps of more importance to the permanent significance of Christianity than the other fact, which, while recognising it in his narratives, he takes no pains to verify. To make good the title "Son of David" as applicable to Jesus was an important

¹ Such was the view of Dr. Ferdinand Baur and other members of the famous Tübingen school.

² *Mark* vi. 3.

function of the apologetic of the apostolic age, especially in a work like that of Matthew probably written for the benefit of Jewish Christians. But that title, in the literal or physical sense, can hardly be vital to the faith of Gentile believers and of all generations. Our faith that Jesus is the Christ does not depend on our being certain that He was physically descended from David. We may satisfy ourselves on independent grounds that He meets all our spiritual needs, and therefore is a true Christ for humanity. And when we have done this, we will have no difficulty in applying to Him the prophetic promise of a seed to David, at least in a spiritual sense, which in this case, as in the case of the Messianic *kingdom*, might conceivably be all the fulfilment the promise was to receive. "If ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed," argued St. Paul.¹ So we, following the same style of reasoning, may say: If Jesus be Christ (shown to be such by what He was and did), then was He David's seed, ideally at least, if not physically.

On the other hand, that Jesus, before He began His prophetic career, occupied the lowly state of a carpenter, is of universal, permanent, and, one may add, ever-increasing significance as a symbolic revelation of the genius of the Christian religion. It is by no means a merely outward, indifferent fact, too trivial for mention in even the fullest account of the life of so great a Personage. It has distinct and great ethical value, both as a biographical fact, and as a means of propagating Christian faith. How much that humble, yet not ignoble, occupation signifies as an element in the education of Jesus! What possibilities it provided of keen insight into the heart of human life, and what protection it afforded against the unrealities and insincerities attaching to more favoured social conditions! Let us not rob it of its significance by remarking that to learn a trade was a fashion among Jews irrespective of

¹ Gal. iii. 20.

rank. The artisan experience of Jesus was more than a fashion complied with; it was a social necessity endured. Jesus was a real, not an amateur, carpenter, the difference being as great as between a volunteer soldier and one who engages in actual fighting. Then what a power lies in this one fact, Jesus a carpenter, to enlist for Him the interest of the million! The toiling multitude in every land and in every age can say: He is one of ourselves. He knows us, and we know Him and trust Him. He fought a good fight for us, for man stripped of adventitious distinction; all honour to His name. It was well for all reasons that the Founder of a universal religion came up out of the humbler social levels with guaranteed sympathy for the many. And it is well that the fact has been distinctly stated in at least one Gospel, for "faith cometh by hearing."

2. Our next example of Mark's realism shall be taken from his account of "The Temptation." "The Spirit driveth Him into the wilderness."¹ Note the word *driveth*, much the strongest to be found in any of the accounts. It points to a powerful force at work, of some kind. And we can have no doubt as to its nature. Of course it was not a physical force exerted to compel a reluctant person to go whither he would not, into the inhospitable regions of a stony desert, where "wild beasts" were the only available companions. The force of the Spirit, as the Evangelist conceives the matter, is brought to bear inwardly, and acts through thought and feeling. In other words, the driving implies and denotes *intense mental preoccupation*. Jesus is thinking earnestly, passionately, of His new vocation and of the future it will bring, and instinctively, inevitably, as if under an irresistible impulse, He retires into the solitudes of Nature congenial to one in so absorbed a mood. What a flash of light this one realistic word "driveth" throws on

¹ Mark i. 12.

the spiritual endowment and disposition of Jesus ! A deep thinker, with a profoundly earnest, passionate temper, and a spirit capable of single-hearted, consuming devotion to a great end : this is what we see by aid of this momentary illumination. And the knowledge we have gained is not confined to the particular experience to which the word is applied. It gives the key to the whole life in all its leading phases ; therefore to those that already lie behind. It explains the departure from Nazareth, and the baptism in the Jordan. It helps us to understand why, and in what mood, Jesus left the home of His childhood and early youth, and the place and instruments of toil. The Spirit was driving Him then and there also ; for we must on no account conceive the Spirit as coming upon Him for the first time after His baptism. The descent of the Spirit recorded by all the Evangelists is rather the objective symbol of an antecedent subjective fact, an inner possession reaching far back into the past years, and at last culminating in the resolve to make that eventful journey southwards. The resolutions of deep, strong natures are not formed suddenly. They are the ripe fruit of early dreams, and lengthened brooding, and much wistful solitary thought. But when the crisis comes, purposes are formed with intense decision, and promptly carried into effect. Then the driving, tempestuous action of the spirit begins, when men called to great careers act in a way that surprises all who do not know what silent processes of preparation have gone before. So it was with Jesus when He left Nazareth ; so when He demanded baptism ; so when He retired into the wilderness. These were three consecutive scenes in the first act of the great drama which terminated on Calvary. Jesus passed through all three by Divine constraint. He *must* leave Nazareth, He *must* be baptized, He *must* bury Himself amid the grim retreats of the wilderness, to master there the abstruse problem of His

new vocation, that He may enter on its duties with clear vision, confirmed will, and pure, devoted heart.

3. A third example of Mark's manner may be found in his account of the first appearance of Jesus in the synagogue of Capernaum.¹ Jesus now appears actually engaged in the work of His high calling, and that account gives a vivid idea of the impression He made immediately upon the people. He did two things on that occasion. He preached, and He cured a man suffering from a disease described as possession by an unclean spirit. By both functions He created astonishment, significantly reflected in the comments of those present, as reproduced in the life-like report of the Evangelist. "What is this?" said they to each other, "What is this? A new teaching! With authority He commandeth even the unclean spirits, and they obey Him."² They were astonished at the immediate cure of the demoniac by an authoritative word, and this is not surprising; but not at that alone. They were not less astonished at the novel kind of preaching, which ordinary readers of the Gospel, I suspect, fail sufficiently to realise. And yet the Evangelist does his best to direct our attention to the fact by an observation brought in at an earlier stage in his narrative.³ In that observation he points out the remarkable feature in Christ's preaching. It was the note of authority, he explains, that took the hearers by surprise. Authority, commanding power in word and deed: that was what struck the worshippers in Jesus as He appeared before them that Sabbath day. And yet they had been accustomed to authority in doctrine. They were constantly hearing in the synagogue of what had been said by the ancients.⁴ Their Rabbis or scribes were never done quot-

¹ *Mark* i. 21.

² *v.* 27, as in the Revised Version, which is based on a different reading in the Greek from that to which the Authorised Version corresponds, according to which the wonder referred only to the act of healing.

³ *v.* 22.

⁴ *Matt.* v. 21.

ing the opinions of those who sat in Moses' seat, and interpreted the meaning of the law. But there was a wide difference between this new Rabbi and all the rest. The Evangelist remarks on it: "Not as the scribes," and we may take for granted that it had struck the people in the synagogue. Jesus spake not *by* authority, like the scribes, citing the names of renowned doctors, but *with* authority—"as one that had authority." He quoted no opinions of others; He simply uttered His own thoughts, and so uttered them that they came home to the minds of listeners with swift, sure effect, producing conviction, admiration, and sudden thrills of pleasure and awe. All this we learn from the simple words, "a new teaching!" reported by Mark as uttered on the spot. Peter was present. Papias, a Church Father, living about the beginning of the second century, tells us that that apostle was the source from whom Mark derived his information. It looks like it here. That lively exclamation: "a new teaching!" sounds like the report of one who had been there, and on whom the spontaneous expression of popular admiration had made an indelible impression.

4. A curious and at first puzzling instance of Mark's realism is supplied in his account of what may be called the *Flight of Jesus from Capernaum*. The story he tells is this:—

"And in the morning, a great while before day, He rose up and went out, and departed into a desert place, and there prayed. And Simon and they that were with Him followed after Him: and they found Him, and say unto Him, All are seeking Thee. And He saith unto them, Let us go elsewhere into the next towns, that I may preach there also, for to this end came I forth."¹

"To this end came I forth," *i.e.* from Capernaum early this morning. Luke gives the matter a different turn. He

¹ Mark i. 35-38, from the Revised Version.

makes no mention of a flight at an early hour, and he changes the apology for flight into a statement by Jesus as to the aim of His mission in general.¹ We must not, in the well-meaning but somewhat officious spirit of the harmonists, force the second Evangelist to say the same thing as the third. Mark's version is historical, not theological; and if we will take it so, we shall get clearer insight into the spirit of Jesus, and the situation in which He was then placed. We assume then that what Jesus said to Peter and the others was that He had left Capernaum in order that He might preach in other towns. From this we learn that Jesus had formed a plan for a preaching tour in Galilee, and that the appearance in the synagogue of Capernaum on the previous day was simply the beginning of its execution. Having delivered His message there, He desires to visit other Galilean synagogues, that He may speak in them words of similar import. That we now fully understand to be His earnest, deliberate purpose. But why such haste, and why such secrecy? Why not stay a little longer in Capernaum, where His words and works are so greatly appreciated, say another week; and why not leave, when He does leave, in open day? There must be urgent reasons for the haste and the secrecy. The reason for the *secrecy* is obvious. All were seeking Him. The people of Capernaum had not had enough of Him, either of His preaching or of His healing power, and they would do their utmost to prevent His going; therefore He stole away while they were asleep. But what was the reason of the *haste*? It must be found in that which constitutes the penalty of sudden and great popularity—the jealousy, envy, and ill-will of those whose vanity or interest is compromised thereby. Jesus taught not as the *scribes*. The scribes knew that as well as the people, and even if no comparisons were made by other hearers, they themselves, such

¹ Luke iv. 42.

of them as were in the audience, would carefully note the difference, and find in it a source of annoyance. Jesus instinctively apprehended danger, and took His measures accordingly. Being earnestly minded to preach in other synagogues, He hasted away, fearing that His opportunity might soon be cut off. He could not speak in the synagogues without the consent of the officials, and who could tell how soon and how far the incipient dislike of the scribes in Capernaum might spread, proving a barrier in His way wherever He went. Therefore He said to Himself: "I must go at once on this preaching mission, that I may speak in as many synagogues as possible, before there has been time for opposition to be organised."

Here was a complicated perplexing situation: immense popularity on the one hand; ill-will in the professional heart, likely ere long to develop into overt action, on the other. We are not surprised to learn that Jesus spent part of that morning in prayer. He did not pray as a matter of course in pursuance of a habit, engaging as it were in His wonted morning devotions. The prayer was special, in reference to an urgent occasion; and though no particulars are mentioned, we can easily imagine its purport. The emergency suggested petitions such as these: that the people in the various places He meant to visit might lend Him a willing ear; that opportunity might not be too soon cut off by the plotting of evil-minded men; that He might be able to speak the word of the kingdom sweetly and graciously, unruffled in spirit by opposition experienced or apprehended; that impressions made on friendly hearers might not run into a merely superficial enthusiasm, or degenerate into an interest having its root in a desire for material benefit. How luminous and instructive that puzzling realistic anecdote of Mark's has at length grown!

5. Our next instance is the remarkable statement peculiar to the second Gospel that the relatives of Jesus at a certain

period said of Him : " He is beside Himself.¹ The passage is somewhat obscure partly owing to its brevity, and as a Catholic commentator long ago remarked,² it is rendered more difficult than it really is by a piety that will not let itself believe that any one could think of Jesus as seems to be reported. But it is best to look the unpleasant fact fairly in the face in hope that it will bring to view some new and notable features in the picture of Jesus.

One thing the fact stated very evidently bears witness to : the moral originality of Jesus. The thought of His relatives simply exemplifies the incapacity of the ordinary man to understand the extraordinary man. Unusual force of mind, or depth of conviction or sincerity in utterance, anything out of the common course in conception or in conduct, is a mystery or even an offence to the average man. It would be his wisdom to stand in silent awe, hat in hand so to speak, before the mystery, as unscientific persons would stand in the presence of a mysterious phenomenon in the physical universe. But men will talk about their moral superiors, they will have their opinions and theories about them, and they have little hesitation in uttering these, however disrespectful or injurious. And so it came to pass that even the friends of Jesus thought and said that He was out of His senses, thereby bearing involuntary testimony to the exceptional greatness of His personality.

The rude speech of these stupid friends testifies further to the enthusiasm of Christ's humanity. It was while He was so busily occupied with His usual work among the people, preaching and healing, that He could not find time to take food that the friends arrived on the scene, and watching His behaviour, came to their sapient conclusion. Much benevolence, they thought, had made Him mad, and in their goodness they desired to rescue Him from the crowd and the excitement, and take Him home to quietness and

¹ *Mark* iii. 21.

² Maldonatus.

rest. Let us pardon their stupidity for the sake of their most reliable testimony to the intensity of Christ's devotion to His beneficent toil. The madness was only in their imagination, but the benevolence was a great indubitable fact. A sacred passion for doing good to others was one of the outstanding characteristics of Jesus; that is what we learn in an emphatic manner from this new instance of Mark's blunt way of telling his story.

From this same instance we may learn further the extensive and extraordinary character of the healing ministry of Jesus. It was so obtrusive a fact that men found it necessary to invent theories to account for it. The friends of Jesus had their theory; looking on while He taught and healed, they said to one another, He is suffering from a disordered mind. Theirs was not the only theory broached; King Herod had his likewise. When he heard of the fame of Jesus as a Healer, he said: It is John the Baptist risen from the dead—just come back to earth from the spirit-world and wielding its mysterious powers.¹ And the scribes and Pharisees had their theory, especially with reference to the cure of demoniacs; Mark places it side by side with that of the friends as if inviting us to compare the two. He casteth out devils, said they, by the prince of devils.² Very unsatisfactory theories all three; the first stupid, the second grotesque, the third malicious and dishonest. Never mind. They all serve an important purpose, that of showing that the healing ministry was a great fact. Men do not theorise about nothing. When theories arise, something has occurred that arrests attention and demands explanation.

Before passing from this instance it is due to Mark to say that he has supplied materials which enable us to see how utterly unfounded was the judgment of the "friends." It is not to be denied that incessant exciting work among the "masses," especially such as makes heavy demands on

¹ *Mark* vi. 14.

Mark iii. 22.

sympathy, brings dangers both to bodily and to mental health. There is need not only for intervals of rest, but for occupations and interests of a different order to help the mind to maintain its balance, and to keep the spirit in perpetual calm. That these were not wanting in the case of Jesus clearly appears in Mark's narrative. Just before he has shown Jesus occupied with the formation of a *disciple-circle*, first selecting from the great crowd a larger group of susceptible spirits with whom He retires to the mountain top, and thereafter by a gradual process choosing from these a smaller circle of twelve.¹ With these chosen companions He remains up there for some time communicating to them such deep wise thoughts as those preserved in Matthew's *Sermon on the Mount*. This might be made clearer to the ordinary reader by a different verse-division and a slightly amended translation, the words "And He cometh into a house"² "being made an independent verse, and the phrase "into a house" being replaced by the one word "home." The narrative will then stand thus,—

V. 19, "And Judas Iscariot, which also betrayed Him (the close of the disciple-list).

V. 20, "And He cometh home."

V. 21, "And the multitude cometh together again so that they could not so much as eat bread."

By leaving a blank space between v. 19 and v. 20 we convey the impression of a considerable interval between the ascent of the mountain (v. 13) and the return to the plain, or the coming *home*, which of itself implies absence for an appreciable time. The blank is the place at which Mark's report of the Teaching on the Hill would have come in had it entered into his plan to record it.

6. Yet another instance of Mark's realistic style must be briefly noticed. It is the tableau of Jesus on the way

¹ Mark iii. 13, 14.

² Mark iii. 19.

to Jerusalem, and the final crisis presented in these words:—

“And they were in the way, going up to Jerusalem, and Jesus was going before them, and they were amazed, and they that followed were afraid.”¹

Again the same intensity which had filled “friends” with astonishment and alarm. But this time the subject which engrosses the thoughts of Jesus is not His beneficent work among the people but His own approaching passion. Walking in advance of the twelve and the larger crowd who followed in the rear, He is as solitary in spirit as He is isolated on the ascending path. Emotions agitate His soul in which His fellow-travellers have no part. The inward mood reveals itself in His outward bearing in such a way as to inspire in spectators wonder and fear. How much was in His mind at that hour: the holy supper, the farewell words, Gethsemane, the cross, all there by vivid anticipation! And how much in His manner as it met the eye: a tragic mood, a hero’s air, the step of one going forward to battle! He told the twelve what He was thinking of, but it was not necessary; they saw it all and were filled with awe. And we see it through the evangelist’s vivid, rapid portraiture, in which gesture is made to tell the tale of unspeakable pathos, firm resolve, heroic daring, faithfulness even unto death.

The foregoing are samples of realistic touches peculiar to Mark and their number might easily be increased. There are others equally significant in which he does not stand alone, Matthew having introduced them into his narrative probably from the pages of his brother Evangelist. Among these may be named the realistic description of the process of digestion in the discourse concerning that which defileth,² the discouraging word to the Syrophenician woman, It is

¹ Mark x. 32.

² Mark vii. 19.

not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs,¹ and the stern word to Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan,² all omitted by Luke, to which may be added in the sphere of action the realistic description of the cleansing of the temple.³ If any one desires to know what is meant by realism, let him compare with Mark's account of that transaction the mild, mitigated report of it given by the third Evangelist. I content myself with a bare reference to these instances, and close with an illustration of Mark's manner taken from the sphere of *doctrine*.

7. Mark's account of the teaching of our Lord is, by comparison with that in the other Gospels, very meagre. Yet it is remarkable that two of the most characteristic utterances of Jesus have been preserved by him alone. These are the saying concerning the Sabbath being made for man,⁴ and the parable of the *Blade*, the *Green Ear*, and the *Ripe Corn*.⁵ The former admirably illustrates the comment on Christ's manner of teaching, "not as the scribes." The saying, the Sabbath exists for man not man for the Sabbath, is diametrically opposed to the scribal method of teaching in religious tendency and spirit. In effect their doctrine was precisely that man existed for the Sabbath. Originally given, as Jesus hinted in the first part of His saying, for man's benefit, as a resting day for weary men, a day of emancipation from toil and drudgery, they had converted it into a day taken from man by God in an exacting spirit, and so established in connection with it a new form of bondage—slavish subjection to an institution. A boon turned into a tyranny—such was the Sabbath as enforced by the scribes; a tyranny restored to a boon—such it became through the redemptive word of Jesus. That word was equally opposed to the scribal method of teaching in manner. No authorities cited, no Rabbi referred to as the

¹ Mark vii. 27.² Mark viii. 33.³ Mark xi. 15-18.⁴ Mark ii. 27.⁵ Mark iv. 26-29.

first to utter so bold a thought. Jesus speaks in His own name, and on His own authority ; a grave word on a vital question, incisive, decisive, final. Once more that word presents a complete contrast to the teaching of the scribes in its ethical character. The scribal mind moved within the region of positive rules, the more minute and unreasonable the better ; the thoughts of Jesus spurned these narrow limits, and were conversant with great moral principles and ultimate truths in religion. No better voucher for this statement could be offered than the saying in which He stated the true relation between the Sabbath and man.

Equally remarkable is the parable of the Blade, the Green Ear, and the Ripe Corn. It states in distinct terms the law of growth or gradual development as a law obtaining in the spiritual world not less than in the natural. It is the most precise, indeed I may say the only precise, enunciation of that law, as reigning in the spiritual sphere, to be found in the New Testament. Some have doubted the genuineness of the parable, regarding it as a secondary form of some other parabolic utterance of Jesus. Surely a groundless doubt ! Who but Jesus could have spoken so felicitous and so philosophical a word ? Not one man known to us in the apostolic age, not even the Apostle Paul. Indeed so far is the great Master above the attainments of the primitive Church in this part of His teaching that one is thankful the parable has been preserved at all, even in a single Gospel. The same remark applies to the saying concerning the Sabbath. Both utterances were, if I may say so, too deep and too thorough-going for the comprehension and sympathies of average disciples. And it is just on this account that I think they may legitimately be used to illustrate the *realism* of Mark. He reports, as they were spoken, these striking words, when the temptation was either to omit or to qualify. He did this doubtless on the authority of one who heard them as they fell from the lips of the Master,

and who, though he might not understand or fully appreciate, could never forget.

These two invaluable words are a welcome contribution in a Gospel in which Jesus appears chiefly as an energetic original actor. They show that the force of His intellect was equal to the force of His will. They also prove that the impassioned temperament was balanced by a deep imperturbable tranquility of spirit; for such great, universal, eternal thoughts visit only minds blessed with perennial repose.

A. B. BRUCE.

THE DATE OF THE EPISTLE OF THE GALLICAN CHURCHES IN THE SECOND CENTURY.

It is commonly assumed that the date of this Epistle is fixed by Eusebius as the seventeenth year of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, A.D. 177. I shall endeavour to show (1) that this is an error, (2) that there are reasons for thinking it to be the seventeenth year of Titus Antoninus Pius, his predecessor, A.D. 155.

It is commonly assumed that certain martyrs who are described by Eusebius as writing to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome—but not bishop till A.D. 177—belong to the number of those mentioned in the Gallican Epistle. I shall endeavour to show (1) that this may not be his meaning, (2) that if it is, he was probably confusing some martyrs who suffered in a later persecution (perhaps A.D. 177) with those who suffered in the earlier persecution recorded in the Gallican Epistle of A.D. 155.

§ 1. "THE SEVENTEENTH YEAR."

The statements of Eusebius as to the Emperor, and the year of the Imperial reign, are brought into connection with each other in the following extracts : (*H.E.*, v., *Proem.*

and *ch.* 1-5) "Now Soter, bishop of the Church of Rome, is succeeded by Eleutherus, twelfth in succession from the apostles. It was *the seventeenth year of the Emperor Antoninus Verus*, in which (or, at which time, ἐν ᾧ), in certain parts of the world, the persecution against us burst out with unusual violence, arising from onsets made on us in the several cities. That myriads of martyrs throughout the empire (οἰκουμένην) met a glorious death (διαπρέψαι), may be conjectured from the events in a single nation—events handed down in writing to posterity. . . . Now the whole compilation of the full and complete information on these points (τῆς μὲν οὖν περὶ τούτων ἐντελεστάτης ὑφηγήσεως τὸ πᾶν σύγγραμμα) has been placed by me in my Collection of Martyrs . . . : but such matters as may have to do with the subject now under consideration . . . I will here quote. . . . (v. 1. 3). And I will quote their own words: 'They that dwell in Vienne and Lyons of Gaul, servants of Christ, to them that are in Asia and Phrygia.' . . . [Here follows a long account of a persecution, in which several martyrs suffered.] (v. 2. 1) Such were the events that came to pass . . . *in the time [of the above-mentioned Emperor, whence one may reasonably conjecture what was also done in the other provinces. To these it is worth while appending next in order from the same volume (γραφῆς) some other extracts, wherein is recorded also the thoughtfulness and gentleness of the above-mentioned martyrs in their very words. [Here the brethren describe how the martyrs prayed for their persecutors and also for relapsers.] . . . (v. 3. 1) But the same volume about the aforesaid martyrs contains also another noteworthy story. [Here follows an account of a revelation to one of the imprisoned martyrs, and of its influence on the conduct of another martyr.] . . . And so much for this (καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὥδὲ ἐχέτω).*¹

¹ On the reasons for supposing that a new section should begin after these words, see below, p. 119.

Now, as the followers of Montanus . . . were just then for the first time diffusing widely (παρὰ πολλοῖς) their views about prophecy, . . . the brethren in Gaul once more¹ submit for consideration their own decision (κρίσιν) on these points also, . . . publishing, too, various letters of the martyrs who had gained the crown of martyrdom among them (τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς τελειωθέντων μαρτύρων)—which letters, while still in bonds, they indited to the brethren in Asia and Phrygia, yea, and to Eleutherus as well, Bishop of Rome at that time, making themselves, as it were, ambassadors (πρεσβεύοντες) for the sake of the peace of the Church. (v. 4. 1) Now the same martyrs also commended Irenæus, who was already at that time a presbyter of the diocese of Lyons, to the above-mentioned Bishop of Rome. . . . (v. 4. 3) But as for matters *in the times of Antoninus* (ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐπ' Ἀ.), such was their tenour. (v. 5. 1) Now² *his brother, Marcus Aurelius Cæsar*, is reported. . . . [Here follows the story of the Thundering Legion, which undoubtedly must be connected with Marcus Aurelius and no other Emperor.] ”

Let us collect the italicized statements: (1) The Emperor under whom the persecution broke out is “Antoninus Verus”; (2) he is called “Antoninus”; (3) his brother is “Marcus Aurelius”; (4) he reigned at least “seventeen years.” This combination of assertions is absurdly erroneous. There certainly was an emperor—namely, the brother of Marcus Aurelius—who is said by one or two historians to have been called Antoninus Verus; but he reigned *nine* years, not “seventeen.” Moreover, there is no other instance in the *History* or *Chronicon* of Eusebius in which he is called “Antoninus Verus,” and no instance at all in which he is simply called “Antoninus.” Some of the confusion is easily explicable. Capitolinus and

¹ See below, p. 120.

² Δῆ; but δέ would make better construction.

Spartianus both agree (Lightfoot, *Ign.*, i. 657) that, on the death of Titus Antoninus Pius, when Marcus Aelius Aurelius Verus ascended the throne, he determined to share it with his younger adopted brother, Lucius Aelius Aurelius Commodus, to whom he gave his own name of "Verus," while both alike assumed the name of "Antoninus" from their predecessor.¹ According to this, the elder brother would cease to be "Verus," and would become "Marcus Aurelius Antoninus"; the younger would cease to be "Commodus," and would become "Lucius Aurelius Verus." But, in practice, the elder Emperor appears to have been still called "Verus" by historians, *and he is so called by Eusebius*; and the younger was not called "Antoninus" in his "style," *and is never so called by Eusebius* (setting aside the passage now under discussion).² Hence we infer that by "Antoninus Verus," and by the subsequent "Antoninus," Eusebius meant Marcus Aurelius. But, then, what are we to say to the astonishing fact that in the very next sentence (v. 5. 1) *Marcus Aurelius is described as this Emperor's brother?*

¹ For the sake of clearness, it may be well to place here the following facts (taken from Lightfoot, *Ign.*, i. 703) concerning the (a) original, (b) adoptive, and (c) imperial, names or styles of the two adopted sons of Titus Antoninus Pius.

(1) The elder, (a) M. Annius Verus, became, when adopted, (b) M. Aelius Aurelius Verus; and, when Emperor, (c) Imp. Cæsar M. Aurelius Antoninus Augustus.

(2) The younger, (a) L. Ceionius Commodus, became, when adopted, (b) L. Aelius Aurelius Commodus; and, when Emperor, (c) Imp. Cæsar L. Aurelius Verus Augustus.

Thus, in *practice*, the elder brother alone took the name of Antoninus, as though T. Antoninus Pius had been his father; while the younger took the name of Verus, as though M. Aelius Aurelius Verus had been his father. But in *theory* (according to the two historians above mentioned) both brothers took the name of Antoninus.

² Eusebius calls the *elder* brother "Antoninus Verus" (in *H.E.*, iv. 13. 8 and 18. 2) at the time when he was Emperor. In iv. 26. 2 and v. 9 he calls him simply "Antoninus." The younger brother is called in the *Chronicon*, at his accession, "Lucius Aurelius Commodus" (so the Hieronymian and Armenian versions—the Greek has καὶ Κόμμοδος, no doubt a mistake for ὁ καί, as, in the same paragraph, Aurelius is called ὁ καὶ Οὐῆρος), and subsequently "Lucius Cæsar."

The most probable explanation is that some phrase containing the words "17th year of Antoninus" was taken by Eusebius out of the Gallican "volume," and inconsistently interpreted by him when he wrote his *History*. In any case the blunders here pointed out could not fail to be detected by him as soon as the *History* was published. If evidence were needed to prove this, it could be proved from his *Chronicon*, which, in its extant shape, is a later work than the *History*. In the interval between the publication of the two, the author appears to have ascertained, not only that some of his dates required correction, but also that the martyrdoms in Gaul had occurred about the same time as the martyrdom of Polycarp in Smyrna; for in the *Chronicon* he places both opposite the same year—namely, "the 7th year" of the two Emperors, M. Aurelius and his brother. He did not venture to place them in "the 17th year" of M. Aurelius, (1) because he now knew there was a blunder *somewhere* in his old date, "17th year of Antoninus Verus"; (2) because it was too radical a reform to make Polycarp's martyrdom quite so late. In the *History* he had connected Polycarp's death with the accession of Aurelius in such vague terms (iv. 15. 1, "meanwhile") as to leave it open whether it happened at the close of the reign of Antoninus Pius or at the beginning of the reign of Aurelius; and he felt certain it was not so late as "the 17th year" of the latter. Now, if it had occurred to him that the blunder was in inserting the "Verus"—which a scribe might naturally have added to define an indefinite "Antoninus"—he would have been able to retain "the seventeenth year of Antoninus," and to refer the date to the reign of Antoninus Pius, and thus he would have anticipated the precise conclusion arrived at fifteen centuries afterwards by Waddington and Lightfoot—viz., that Polycarp was martyred in A.D. 155, viz., "the seventeenth year" of Titus Antoninus Pius. Unfortunately

he took a much more natural course. He compromised the matter in the *Chronicon* by supposing that Polycarp's martyrdom might be a little later than he had thought, and the Gallican a little earlier. "Very possibly 17 was a mistake for 7. So be it. Then let the date of the joint martyrdoms go down in the *Chronicon* as the 7th year of Marcus Aurelius and his brother, *i.e.* A.D. 167."

That we are doing no injustice to Eusebius in accepting, upon less than demonstrative evidence, the hypothesis that he was somewhat careless about dates, may be inferred from several passages in Lightfoot's *Ignatius*, e.g. i. 620, 621; and especially from one dealing with the passage under discussion: (*Ign.*, i. 631) "Eusebius, therefore, is convicted of gross ignorance respecting the imperial annals at this time. He has prolonged the life of L. Verus for several years, and he has hopelessly confused the two imperial brothers." This is, perhaps, rather too severe on the historian. The reader himself may have found it a little difficult to keep in mind the distinctions between the original names and the adopted names, and the imperial titles, of the two Emperors who succeeded Antoninus Pius; and Eusebius may well have experienced a similar difficulty. It is probable that the letter of the Churches in Gaul was originally dated "the 17th year of Antoninus"; but in a few years the question was sure to arise, "*Which* Antoninus?" The copy that fell into the hands of Eusebius may have added "Verus"; or "the 17th year of Antoninus *Verus*" may have been given in the volume as the date of *later* martyrdoms, and may have been taken as giving the date of *earlier* martyrdoms as well. Hastily assuming this to be correct, the historian seems to have accepted "Antoninus Verus" as accurate in the strict historical sense in which it would have been understood by Capitolinus and Spartianus, *i.e.* as representing the younger brother of Aurelius; and accordingly

he describes M. Aurelius as his "brother."¹ Our conclusion is that Eusebius may have erred not so much through gross ignorance as through blindly following a document that led him into error: "17th year of Antoninus" might have led him right, but "17th year of Antoninus Verus" would lead him wrong.²

§ 2. THE GALLICAN "VOLUME."

But at this point we are confronted by a seemingly solid objection. How could the Gallican martyrs have written about Montanism to Bishop Eleutherus in A.D. 155, since he was not Bishop till A.D. 177? And how could they have been troubled in Gaul about Montanism in A.D. 155, if (as the *Chronicon* says) it did not "arise" in Phrygia till A.D. 172? At this point, Eusebius' exact words require the closest examination. They will be found to state merely that "*the same martyrs*" who sent letters to Asia about Montanism also sent a letter to Eleutherus. They do not state that *any of the martyrs mentioned in the Gallican Epistle* wrote these letters. What if the "volume" from which he extracted his account contained a number of documents describing various Gallican persecutions that took place under the Antonines? And what if some martyrs—perhaps, actually in "the 17th year" of M. Aurelius Antoninus, i.e. A.D. 177, five years or there-

¹ Not improbably Eusebius, or the writer from whom Eusebius borrowed, was influenced here by Christian tradition, which (see Tertull., *Apol.*, 5) represented M. Aurelius as the protector of the Church, and as testifying to the efficacy of its prayers. The character of M. Aurelius was preserved by stating that the persecution took place "in the year of"—a phrase that suggested "with the sanction of"—his brother.

² Lightfoot suggests that (*Ign.*, i. 630-32) in the *Chronicon*, Eusebius may have grouped together the Gallican and Smyrnan martyrdoms because he did not know their precise date; but this is inconsistent with the supposition that he retained his confidence in "the 17th year of Antoninus Verus" as the precise date of the former. And if he did not retain his confidence in it, then the evidence for it (so far as the authority of Eusebius is concerned) disappears.

abouts after the rise of Montanism in Phrygia—wrote the letter in question to the recently appointed Bishop Eleutherus? This would at once make everything clear. If there was a persecution in Lyons “in the 17th year of T. Antoninus” (A.D. 155), contemporary with that of Polycarp, and another “in the 17th year of M. Antoninus” (A.D. 177), about five years after Montanism sprang up, and if the former was entitled in Eusebius’ collection of MS., “In the 17th year of Antoninus,” and the latter, “In the 17th year of Antoninus Verus”—how natural to infer (1) that the two described the same event, (2) that the earlier Emperor could not be meant, since some of “the same martyrs” wrote letters to Bishop Eleutherus, who was not bishop until long after that Emperor’s death!

“But what reason have we for supposing that Eusebius could make such a blunder?” This reason, that *he has made a similar blunder, only worse, in dealing with another “volume” of martyrdoms*. In describing Polycarp’s martyrdom, Eusebius speaks of a “volume (γραφῆ)” containing other martyrdoms continuously narrated. These he mentions as occurring “about the same period of time,” and proceeds to narrate one of them, that of Pionius. “But,” says Lightfoot (*Ign.*, i. 624), “Eusebius falls into a serious error with regard to its date. In the chronological notice appended to the document, as we have seen, the martyrdom is stated to have taken place under Decius (A.D. 250); and internal evidence points to this epoch. But Eusebius apparently makes it nearly synchronous with Polycarp’s martyrdom, and therefore under the Antonines.” Now if, *in spite of a notice in the MS. stating that a martyrdom took place in the reign of Decius A.D. 250, Eusebius synchronizes it with one that took place under the Antonines about A.D. 155*, does it need a great stretch of uncharitable imagination to suppose that, in some similar “volume” containing a number of Gallican martyrdoms, he committed the same

mistake of synchronizing here, only with far more excuse owing to the identity of the imperial name ("Antoninus"), and possibly also the identity of the imperial year ("seventeenth")?

Again, the language of Eusebius himself, in quoting from the Gallican "volume," will be found, if carefully examined, to contain one slight indication of *an interval between the writing of the Gallican Epistle and the letters to Eleutherus*. Turning to the extracts at the beginning of this article, the reader will see that the "volume" contained, first, the Gallican Epistle, from which extracts are given; then (v. 2, 1) a section containing anecdotes concerning those who were confessors but not martyrs; then another (v. 3, 1) about a revelation (possibly one of many) to those in prison. Then comes a formula ("So much for this. . . . But") *habitually employed by Eusebius to indicate the conclusion of one subject and transition to another*.¹

Here, therefore, a new chapter ought to have commenced, thus: "Now whereas the heresy of Montanus was just then for the first time (ἄρτι τότε πρῶτον) coming into general note, . . . the brethren in Gaul *once more* (αὐθις)²

¹ καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὥδι ἐχέτω. τῶν δ' ἀμφί.... These or similar words are *habitually used to introduce a new chapter*: comp. i. 4-5, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ὥδε ἐχέτω. Φέρε δέ...: i. 7-8, ὥδι μὲν οὖν καὶ ταῦτα ἐχέτω. Ἀλλὰ γάρ...: i. 11-12, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἐχέτω ταύτη. Τῶν γε μὴν...: iv. 14-15, Ἀντωνῖνον μὲν δὴ τὸν Ἐ. κληθέντα... διαδέχεται. Ἐν τούτῳ δέ...: iv. 18-19, καὶ τὰ μὲν κατὰ τόνδε τοιαῦτα ἦν. Ἡδὴ δέ...: iv. 23-24, τὰ μὲν τοῦ Δ. τοσαῦτα. Τοῦ δὲ Θ...: iv. 26-27, τὰ μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ Μ. τοσαῦτα. Τοῦ δὲ Ἀ...: iv. 29-30, καὶ τὰ μὲν κατὰ τοῦσδε τοιαῦτα ἦν. Ἐπὶ δέ...: v. 4-5, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ἐπ' Ἀ. τοιαῦτα. Τούτου δὴ (? δέ).... More than once a book terminates with μὲν (e.g. v. 28, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοῦτον ἱστορήσθω τὸν τρόπον, after which, the next book begins with Ὡς δέ). Somewhat exceptionally, the sentence with μὲν...δὲ introduces a new chapter in iii. 10. 11, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ... (δε)δηλώσθω, ἴωμεν δ' ἐπὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

All this indicates that the text here has been misarranged, and that a new chapter should have begun with Τῶν δ' ἀμφί.... There has probably been a similar misarrangement in i. 12. 5, ταῦτα μὲν οὖν περὶ τῶνδε. τῆς δὲ περὶ τὸν Θαδδαῖον ἱστορίας τοιοῦτος γέγονεν ὁ τρόπος. A new chapter should have begun with Τῆς δέ (unless this is an exceptional transition like that in iii. 10. 11).

² This use of αὐθις is quite distinct from that of καὶ αὐθις in v. 2, 5, 6, for there the context shows the interval to be that of a few words in a document.

submit their own decision. . . .” Compare the language in which the historian elsewhere, *after mentioning a considerable interval of peace for the Church*, proceeds to say that the devil, finding this intolerable (v. 21. 1), “*accordingly stripped once more for the conflict* (*ἀπεδύετο δ’ οὖν αὐθις*),” and it will be seen that the use of this adverb, as well as the transitional formula above mentioned, decidedly favours the supposition of an interval here. Possibly Eusebius is describing from the Gallican “volume” what “the brethren *once more*” did, and was not aware of the exact intention of the writer whose words he was using. The latter may have meant to say that [whereas they had previously sent to the churches of Asia, along with the account of the martyrdoms in the 17th year of [Titus] Antoninus, some expression of their own opinion on disputed points, now, in the 17th year of [Marcus] Antoninus], in consequence of the Montanist heresy, “*which was just then for the first time coming into note*,” the brethren in Gaul “*once more submitted*” to their correspondents an expression of opinion, together with letters from martyrs who had recently suffered. Even if Eusebius did not take the words thus, this is a justifiable interpretation of them; and he may as well have misinterpreted these expressions as he has misinterpreted “the 17th year of Antoninus Verus.” As in many other instances, Eusebius appears to be faithfully transcribing an original from which he possibly draws an erroneous inference.

§ 3. INTERNAL EVIDENCE FAVOURS THE EARLIER DATE.

In arguing for the earlier date of the martyrdom of Polycarp, Lightfoot justly calls attention to the fact that (*Ign.*, i. 650) “throughout the Smyrnæan Letter the singular is

“And again *after a short interval* they say (*καὶ αὐθις μετὰ βραχέα φασίν*).... And then they say, *after other expressions* (*καὶ αὐθις φασὶ μεθ’ ἑτερα*).” It differs also from the use of (v. 4. 3) *καὶ αὐθις* (“and then again”) in enumerations.

used of the Emperor." The same argument applies to the Gallican Epistle. In "the 17th year" of M. Aurelius (*i.e.* A.D. 177) there would be two emperors, for he was by that time co-emperor with his son Commodus.¹ Yet the singular is used in the narrative of the Gallican martyrs in describing how (v. 1, 44) the governor applied to Cæsar for instructions, and (*ib.* 57) Cæsar gave them. The inference drawn in the case of Polycarp is also to be drawn here, that "Cæsar" is Titus Antoninus Pius, who reigned alone.²

Again, a great many expressions in the Gallican Epistle indicate that persecution *had been for a long time discontinued*, that it now suddenly burst out in consequence of the action of the populace, that the governor and the officials led the populace rather than followed them, and that, owing to the want of recent precedent, the authorities were in some perplexity as to the course to be taken. Eusebius himself tells us that (*H. E.* v. *Proem.*) the persecution broke out like a conflagration, using the same word with which he describes the outbreak of the Jewish war.³ He does not mean in the former case that there had been a persecution before, just as in the latter he does not mean that there had been a war before. He means, in both cases, that there had been smouldering embers which were now suddenly "fanned into a flame." The Gallican brethren repeatedly refer to the intense hatred of the people against them, to the (v. 1-7 *passim*) insults, onsets, and outrages from "the mob" and "the infuriated multitude," both before they were brought

¹ This argument is equally destructive to the date given by the *Chronicon*, "the 7th year" of M. Aurelius; for at that time he was still co-emperor with his brother Lucius.

² It must be admitted, however, that as Commodus in A.D. 177 was an emperor of very recent creation, the argument is not so strong as it otherwise would have been. The young Emperor might be practically overlooked.

³ *H. E.*, ii. 26. 1: τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀναβρίπισθῆναι τοῦ πολέμου. There were always at hand the precedents of Nero and Domitian, to which the populace could appeal when some famine, drought, or earthquake excited them against the Christian "atheists."

before the authorities, and afterwards during their examinations and sufferings. They tell us that, as if he had gone too far, the governor writes to Cæsar to know what he is to do, not only as to Roman citizens, but also as to all those in prison. He awaits the imperial reply, which is that those who will not deny Christ shall be beaten to death, but the others are to be released. Here the irregularity of the previous proceedings is patent; for (v. 1. 33) those who had denied Christ already had been kept in prison and had partaken in the hardships of the confessors.

All these popular excesses, these official irregularities, and especially the appeal to the emperor, exactly suit the 17th year of Titus Antoninus, when the populace in many parts of the empire was attempting to revive disused persecution. Trajan had not encouraged persecutions. Hadrian had gone further and so discouraged them that in his reign they appear to have been almost non-existent; but that in the later part of the reign of Titus Antoninus (who reigned A.D. 138-61) they had broken out with extraordinary violence, and that they continued without any long intermission during the remainder of his reign and that of his successor, is proved by the convergent testimony, direct and indirect, of (a) non-Christian and (b) Christian writers. (a) Galen (about A.D. 160) says (*Lightf., Ign.*, i. 515-21), "That the Christians despise death, we see for ourselves"; Lucian (about A.D. 165) introduces a character saying that Pontus is full of atheists and Christians, who are to be stoned to death if people would have the favour of heaven; Marcus Aurelius himself (about A.D. 174) writes of the readiness of the Christians to meet death; (b) Justin Martyr, about mid-way between A.D. 140 and 160, and not improbably about A.D. 155, speaks of crucifixions, beheadings, burnings and other punishments, as being endured by Christians at the time when he was writing; Melito tells us that Titus Antoninus himself wrote to "*the cities,*" and among the

rest to "all the Greeks," commanding them to desist from irregular violence against the Christians; Minucius Felix (placed by Lightf. about A.D. 160) speaks of tortures as being then borne by men, women, and children. About A.D. 163 (Lightf., *Ign.*, i. 494) Justin Martyr and others, brought before the Prefect of Rome, are simply "interrogated one after the other, confess themselves Christians, and are ordered off to execution." This very fact is made a ground of complaint in a treatise of Athenagoras (A.D. 177) that (Lightf., *Ign.*, i. 521) "the very name" of "Christian" suffices to ensure death. In the face of such a continuity from A.D. 155 to A.D. 177, who can deny that there must be some error in a statement that persecution "broke out like a fire from smouldering embers" at the latter date? And how could a Governor of Lyons in A.D. 177, with the precedents of more than twenty years before him, fail to know what must be done with imprisoned Christians, and find himself obliged to trouble the emperor for special instructions? But place the "breaking out" of the conflagration in A.D. 155 and under an emperor who had recently written to "all the Greeks" to desist from turbulence against the Christians, and then the language of Eusebius becomes justifiable and the conduct of the governor intelligible.

§ 4. THE EVIDENCE OF CIRCUMSTANCES.

The following objection must now be met. We know that Irenæus was not yet bishop of Lyons when the Gallican martyrs commended him, as an "elder," to Bishop Eleutherus A.D. 177. Now the death of Pothinus is described by the Gallican Epistle, which (if the earlier date be adopted) was written A.D. 155. This necessitates an interval between the two bishops of at least twenty-two years, and possibly many more. But Eusebius asserts in his *History* that (v. 5. 8) when Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, died, Irenæus succeeded him.

This assertion, however, is not supported by the *Chronicon*, nor by any other independent testimony, and it is full of difficulties. For how could a bishop, succeeding to a diocese under persecution, leave martyrs in prison, and his whole flock in danger, in order to travel to Rome? Some have suggested that there may have been a vacancy for two or three years; others, that he did not go to Rome at all. Since conjecture of some kind is needed, it is at least reasonable to conjecture that some other bishop may have been immediately appointed in A.D. 155, and that Irenæus, when appointed, succeeded, long afterwards, to the bishopric of Lyons indeed, but not as the immediate successor of Pothinus. This exactly suits the arrangement and statements in the *Chronicon*, which says nothing about "succession," but, under the fifth year of Commodus (*i.e.* A.D. 180 or 181), says simply, "Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, a city of Gaul, was famous (διέλαμπε) for his divine words and works." The assertion in the *History* is not difficult to explain. Eusebius had before him a letter from martyrs of Lyons commending Irenæus, an elder of Lyons, to Bishop Eleutherus, who became bishop of Rome A.D. 177. At the time when he was composing the *History* he believed that Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, died as a martyr at that date. He knew that Irenæus became bishop of Lyons. Putting these facts together, he hastily inferred that Irenæus became bishop by *immediate* succession to Pothinus. But it appears to have been nothing but an inference, and it is quite possible that if he had given a definite date in the *Chronicon*, he would have given a different one from that implied in the *History*.

On the other hand, if Pothinus died A.D. 155, in the same year as Polycarp, and if Irenæus did not come to Lyons till afterwards, this explains why Irenæus, in the whole of his works, makes no mention of the venerable bishop. Had he seen the nonagenarian martyr in the flesh, had he worked

with him in his diocese, he could hardly have refrained from telling us some such anecdotes about him as he has told us about Polycarp. Tradition relates that, (Lightf., *Ign.*, ii. 986) on the day on which Polycarp was martyred, Irenæus was at Rome and heard a voice from heaven announcing the fact. This agrees with our hypothesis that in that year he was not in Lyons. Again, if Irenæus had been in Lyons at the time of the persecution recorded in the Gallican Epistle, we might surely expect that the sayings of the martyrs, when quoted by him, would have been quoted, if not exactly, at all events without flagrant error. Now a reference of Irenæus to these martyrs is preserved in a compressed form¹ by Œcumenius; but, beside being tediously lengthy as compared with the Gallican narrative, it also misses the point of one of the replies of the martyrs, and ascribes it to the well-known and heroical Blandina, whose unshaken constancy amazed even her torturers, whereas it was really uttered (*H.E.*, v. 1. 25) by poor Biblias, one who denied her Lord, but who returned to her allegiance under the rack. Inaccurate though Irenæus is, he could hardly have committed this error had he been presbyter of Lyons when the sufferings and sayings of Blandina and Biblias were in the ears of every Christian in the place. But allow that he was in Rome when the first persecution was raging (A.D. 155), that he did not come to Lyons till, say, A.D. 170-5, and did not become bishop till, say, A.D. 180-5, and then we can well understand that, by the time he was composing his *Refutation*, the memory of Pothinus had become a thing of the past, so that the new bishop had nothing to say about the old bishop, whom he had never seen, and from whom he was divided by one or two predecessors and by an interval of twenty-five or thirty years; nor can it then be surprising if, in referring casually to the earliest Antoninian

¹ Irenæus fragm. 13, ed. Grabe, p. 469: Œcumenius says "to quote it briefly (ὡς διὰ βραχέων παραθέσθαι)."

persecutions without having the "volume" before him, he confused details of which he knew nothing except by oral tradition and writing.

In conclusion it may be pointed out that the date here advocated is obtained, not by conjecture, however plausible, but *by correcting Eusebius from Eusebius, in accordance with the researches of Waddington and Lightfoot.* The historian Eusebius mentions "the 17th year of Antoninus Verus," a manifest error. The chronicler Eusebius substitutes (by implication) (1) "7th year of M. Antoninus," and (2) "simultaneous with the martyrdom of Polycarp." Of these two corrections, we reject the former (as being probably the result of a mere conjecture), but accept the latter, subject to this condition, that the date of Polycarp's martyrdom shall be held to be determined by modern researches to be A.D. 155. Now this is "the 17th year of Antoninus," but "*Antoninus Pius*," not "*Antoninus Verus*." Hence, recurring to the statement in the *History*, we adopt it, as giving *the right year but the wrong Antoninus.* We then show how easily the wrong Antoninus could have been substituted for the right one; and lastly, how the right one harmonizes with the internal evidence derivable from the Gallican Epistle, with the general history of Christian persecutions, and with the language of Eusebius and Irenæus, not to speak of a considerable mass of historical detail.¹

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

¹ Since writing this article, I have seen Mr. Bryant's useful work, *The Reign of Antoninus Pius* (Pitt Press, 1895). Indirectly, it affords evidence for the earlier date of the Gallican Epistle by showing that (1) a dedication at Delphi A.D. 150 in honour of Antoninus Pius combines with a number of coins and inscriptions to show that at this time a religious revival was going on; (2) a disastrous and wide-spread earthquake occurred A.D. 152, and this might intensify religious feeling against the Christians for several years to come; (3) Antoninus, A.D. 155, was visiting the East, so that popular outbursts against the Christians might more easily break out, contrary to the emperor's previous procedure, and yet unchecked, because he was not at hand to check them.

A SPIRITUAL HOUSE.

(1 PETER II. 5.)

IN passages like this we discover the true ideal of Christian character. They are among the most practical passages in the New Testament. They affect every province of conduct. For we learn how we ought to live by learning what we are. And passages like this not only give the law of Christian perfection; they contribute the motives, they sustain the spiritual force, by which Christian perfection is achieved.

To this ideal greatness and sanctity we are called. If we have come to Christ, we have come to Him "*as a living stone, rejected indeed of men, but with God elect, precious,*"—or "*honourable*"; and we also, "*as living stones,*" are to be "*built up*" on Him "*a spiritual house,*" "*to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.*"

"*The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner.*" The quotation is from Psalm cxviii.—a psalm written for some great festival, after the return of the Jewish people from exile. It is a psalm full of natural exultation and magnificent hope. To the great powers which seemed to hold the fortunes of the world in their hands, there was nothing in the Jewish nation to honour or to fear. It counted for nothing. They refused to give it any place in the political order. "But the stone which the builders rejected is become the head stone of the corner." In the divine order, the elect nation had a greater place than the secular empires which surrounded it, and its destinies were more august. Rejected of men, it was to be the corner stone of the great structure of human history which was rising under the Divine hand.

And Peter quotes the words as being still truer of Christ than of the nation. Christ, who was rejected of men, is the corner stone of that great spiritual house which is the very home of the Eternal. Yes, the true home of God in this world is that spiritual society which consists of all who have "come to" Christ—to use Peter's words—and who are built on Christ: God lives in them.

When Christ was visibly present among men God lived in Christ. The glory of God dwelt in Him. The power and perfection of God were revealed through Him. Approaching Him, men approached God. Those who really saw Him saw God. And now the power and perfection of God are revealed, though imperfectly, in Christian men. Now the glory of God dwells in them. For they are one with Christ. They are living stones in the spiritual house of which He is the chief corner stone.

They are made one with Him. They do not merely acknowledge His authority with reverence; nor do they merely rely on Him with a confident faith; nor do they merely love Him with a passionate love. It is not merely by some isolated acts of their spiritual life that they are connected with Him. They themselves, according to the Divine idea and purpose, are one with Him. The union—as suggested by this passage—is as close as that which we could conceive of as binding together the foundations and walls of some stately building, if the stones began to live, and if a common life extended through them all. Together, they and Christ constitute a spiritual house, in which God dwells.

A spiritual, not a material house. For the home of God is in no visible temple; and to suppose that in these Christian times there can be any real sanctity in a mere building is to Judaize. During Christ's earthly life He declared that He Himself was greater than that temple which had been in a sense the home of God; for God

really dwelt in Him, while in the temple there was only the visible symbol of the Divine presence. And now the greatness which belonged and still belongs to Christ is extended to all the living stones in the spiritual house in which Christ is the head of the corner. God dwells in every one of us. And so the obscurest, humblest Christian man is greater than the most venerable and splendid of the buildings which kings and nobles and great nations have enriched with gold and silver and costly marbles, which have been adorned by the genius of famous painters, and in which many generations of men have worshipped God. It is man who is sacred,—man when made one with Christ. God is a Spirit; and He dwells not in material buildings, no matter by what solemn and mysterious rites it may be attempted to consecrate them. He, a Spirit, dwells in the spirit of man, and reveals His righteousness and love in the life of man. Yes, to me the poor seamstress that turns into Westminster Abbey for half an hour's quiet and peace and meditation on Christ, who has saved her, is more sacred than the venerable building which is associated with the most famous events in the history of our country; she should be treated with greater reverence. To me the beggar in her rags on the steps of St. Peter's is more sacred than the vast church which is the material centre of a communion extending over the whole world. In the Christian man is the true Shekinah; even the visible glory—which was the symbol of the unseen—has now passed away; the inner life of the Christian is the true Holy of Holies: God is there.

And while this may be said of every individual Christian—for each one is the temple of the Holy Spirit—the Divine thought is still more nobly fulfilled in the whole company of the faithful. Together, through this union with Christ, they form one great spiritual house. The whole flock of God is not to be found in any visible fold: in the East and

the West, among Catholics and Protestants, in Churches of every name, all that have come to Christ are built into one noble and glorious structure in which God dwells. And it becomes us to remember that they form part of that spiritual house as well as ourselves. We should hold together in the life of the spirit, however widely we may be separated in the life of the flesh.

We are not only a spiritual house in which God dwells: we are *priests*, and have immediate access to God in Christ. Every Christian man is a priest,—separated from the common world, consecrated to God's service. His life is not secular: it does not really belong to the visible order: it has a divine root and divine functions. And as in old Jewish times no man of his own will could become a priest, as the priesthood consisted of those and of those only who had been appointed to the priesthood by God Himself, so is it now; we are priests by divine appointment and divine consecration. Each one of us is a priest, with the awful and glorious prerogatives of priesthood; with access to God for ourselves, and with the duty of using that access for others. For priests did not approach God for themselves alone; they represented all the people.

It has been suggested that while it is true that all Christians are in a sense priests, some are priests in a larger sense than others,—priests by office, with exceptional and mysterious powers. That has been the belief of a great part of Christendom for many centuries. It is the belief of large numbers of the English people at the present moment. The theory, I say, concedes that in a very true sense all Christians are priests, but asserts that their priestly functions and powers are exercised through the ministers of the Church who have been destined to priestly service. The Jewish nation was a nation of priests, and yet there was a separate priesthood which on behalf of the nation served at the altar of God.

In the case of the Jewish nation, however, no mistake was possible. A tribe a family, was separated from the rest of the nation by Divine authority, was consecrated to priestly duties. Laws, most explicit, most rigid, distinguished between the priests and the people. But where do we find in the New Testament, explicitly or by implication, any hint of such a distinction as that between the minister of the Church and ordinary Christians? Where does Christ affirm or imply any such distinction. Where do the apostles affirm or imply it? Surely when insisting that all Christians are priests, it would have been natural to suggest that some are priests in a sense in which others are not. If there were nothing more, some traces of it might have been found in the names by which the officers of the Church are denoted. But there is no trace of it. We read of apostles, evangelists, bishops or overseers, elders, deacons or servants, but of priests never.

No; this is the old Judaism again, and in one of its worst and most pernicious forms. Every Christian man is a priest in as true and full and noble and sacred a sense as any other Christian man is a priest. I could not be more of a priest than I am now if all the bishops, archbishops and patriarchs of Christendom laid their hands on my head. They could confer on me no sanctity that I have not received direct from the Spirit of God, no powers that have not been given by the infinite grace of Christ. And every Christian man or woman is as much a priest as I am.

The controversy is not about words; it is not about curious subjects of ecclesiastical antiquity and theological speculation; it affects the greatness and reality of the Christian redemption; it affects morals; it affects the Christian ideal of life. This distinction between the Christian priesthood and the Christian laity lies at the root of some of the worst evils which have corrupted Christendom.

If the ministers of the Church are priests,—consecrated to God in a sense in which other Christians are not,—then the life of the ordinary Christian may be less sacred, less completely devoted to God than the life of the minister. If the minister is a priest and the ordinary Christian is not, then the minister has a nearer, freer access to God than the ordinary Christian, and the ordinary Christian is under inferior obligations to worship and to pray. If the minister is a priest and the ordinary Christian is not, the priest will be required to illustrate a nobler idea of morality, and the ordinary Christian will suppose that he may be content with a less austere and less gracious righteousness.

We are the true Sacerdotalists—we who maintain that all Christian men are priests, through their union with Christ and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. What priest, or bishop, or archbishop, or patriarch or pope, can assert or claim any priestly dignity that is not mine, through the great love of God? Has he immediate access to God? So have I. I have access to God in Christ, and he has no diviner prerogative. I do not need his intervention to enable me to find God: God is my Father, and the priest my brother. I can speak to God for myself. Has the priest the right to intercede with God for others? So have I. I can pray for others as well as for myself, in Christ's name; and the priest can urge no mightier, no diviner plea.

The promises that God will answer prayer are mine as well as his. Has he authority to tell men that their sins are forgiven? I have the same authority as he. I too can tell them in God's name that Christ died for the sins of the world; and I too can tell them that this is certain—that if they have trusted in the mercy of God to forgive and to save, they are really forgiven. And if he says more than that, he is imperilling the souls of men.

Does he tell me that by uttering words of mysterious

power he can secure the real presence of the Lord Jesus Christ in the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper? I deny his claim. But I assert in answer a divine prerogative for the commonalty of the Church. Where two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, Christ Himself is among them. It is not the presence of the priest, but the presence of Christ, that makes the Lord's Supper a sacrament and means of grace. And, further, Christ is not in the bread; He is not in the wine: if He were, of what avail would it be? He is one of the company, and He draws the rest into closer union with Himself, and dwells, not in the material symbols, but in us.

Every Christian man is a priest; but together we constitute a "*priesthood*." And in affirming our own dignity, we should remember that it is shared by all who have received the Christian faith, and who are made one with Christ. We resent and reject the special claims of those who assert that they are priests in a sense in which we are not, but we should thank God that they are priests as we are priests, and should rejoice in their sanctity as well as in our own. And when we meet to worship God, and to pray for ourselves and other men, we may find new courage and new faith when we remember the millions of other churches in this land and in other lands who also meet to worship and to pray, and we should unite our worship and prayers with theirs.

Priests—and if priests, we are to "*offer sacrifices*." The sacrifices are "*spiritual*," like the temple in which they are offered. They originate in the spiritual life of man, under the inspiration of the Spirit of God; they are spiritual acts. Mere external acts, however striking, however splendid, however impressive, are worthless. Only if there is real spiritual grace in them can they be acceptable to God, and then only through Christ. The external pomp, the artistic beauty, are of no account; nor the excitement and

passion and delight which the pomp and beauty may create. The sacrifices we have to offer are spiritual.

They begin with the sacrifice of ourselves—our very life—to God. We have to part with all personal aims : these are no longer to be the great ends of life ; to please God perfectly and to please Him in all things—this must be our supreme end. Then may come acts of worship ; and their worth is measured, not by the stateliness and beauty of the words of adoration which are on our lips, but by the reverence and awe and trust and gratitude which are in our hearts : songs of thanksgiving and praise ; and their worth is measured, not by the pathos or fire of the hymn, not by the passion and perfection of the music, but by an inward joy in God and in His great salvation : prayer for ourselves, intercession for others ; and the vehemence, the energy, the fulness with which we speak—even though in our excitement tears may come—are nothing ; the real question is, whether in our hearts we earnestly long for the blessings we ask for, and whether we trust God to bless us : acts of service, religious work, merciful deeds for the relief of suffering and the cheering of sorrow and the rescue of men from misery as well as sin,—these, too, may be spiritual sacrifices, but not unless they are prompted by a genuine inward devotion to God and man : gifts of money for the maintenance of worship, of missions at home and abroad, and of schools, of hospitals, and of all other institutions and agencies for getting the will of God done on earth as it is done in heaven,—these, too, may be “ *spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Christ.*” But they must be spiritual ; their original spring and motive must be in that region of your life from which worship comes, and prayer and thanksgiving. It is not the amount that is given that makes the gift acceptable through Christ, though the amount, if less than you ought to give, may prevent it from being acceptable ; it is the spirit, it is the

purpose, with which it is given, that makes it spiritual; and it must be spiritual if it is to be acceptable through Christ.

I have said that every Christian man is a spiritual house—a temple of God—but that the great house of God is constituted of all Christian men; that every Christian man is a priest, but that we do not stand apart and alone—solitary priests, at a solitary altar; all Christian men constitute a holy priesthood. But intervening between the individual Christian and the great company of the faithful in all lands, there is the particular Church to which we belong; and, according to Christ's idea, it is through that Christian society that we are to realize the communion of saints with all the power and blessedness which that communion secures.

The Church with which we meet is by Christ's purpose a spiritual house. He is the great Head of the corner, a living stone; and we are all living stones built up in Him, and God dwells in us. In our personal life elsewhere we are to fulfil God's idea of what His temple should be in the individual Christian man; there we are to fulfil God's idea of what the temple should be in the Church. It is not the visible building which is the true house of God, but the Christian society that meets in it. We could repair the building without much difficulty if harm came to it, or build another; but it might be worth while for us to ask whether the walls of the true invisible building are sound; whether there is any sign that the walls are leaning away from the foundation; whether any of the living stones have forgotten that they belong to the building—have dropped out, leaving here and there ugly rents through which the wind and rain come, making it harder for the rest to stand erect; whether all the stones cling together in the power of their common life and of a strong mutual affection; whether any of us ever forget that it is no

common secular structure to which we belong, but a temple in which God dwells. It might be well to ask ourselves that question: we can judge ourselves; other people it is dangerous to judge.

We are priests together; do we remember our official functions? Do we faithfully discharge them? Are we never absent without necessity, when we ought to be blending our worship with the worship of our brethren, and our prayers and thanksgivings with theirs? When we seem to be present, are we sometimes absent—in the counting-house, in the manufactory; or while we appear to be sitting at the feet of Jesus like Mary, are we troubled about household cares like Martha? We keep a register of the actual attendance of the members of the choir who assist the expression of our praise: God keeps a register of the actual attendance of those who stand before Him to offer the inward praise; how many unnecessary absences does the register reveal?

The other spiritual sacrifices which as a Church we ought to offer to God—do we all take part in them, doing all the work for His sake that we might do; giving for His sake all that we might give? Or are there any of us who, through neglecting our own share of the work, leave others overcharged; and through withholding our own gifts, occasion anxiety and perplexity to others, and create obstacles and difficulties which, if we were faithful, would at once disappear? And to whatever degree of fidelity, earnestness, generosity and zeal, we may have attained, we are not already perfect. Let us remember God's own conception, and the great ideal which He has set before us. We are all "*living stones*"—all "*a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.*"

R. W. DALE.

THE LAWFUL ASSEMBLY.

(ACTS XIX. 39.)

WHILE it is a very important thing to study the books of the New Testament in connexion with the actual life and circumstances of the countries and cities in which the events occurred, it is doubly important that the circumstances by which it is sought to illustrate the books should be correctly conceived, as otherwise the light that is cast may be misleading. If I venture in the pages of this magazine to bring forward some examples to show the necessity of carefulness in this useful work of illustrating the New Testament writers, it is not that I have any claim to be immaculate myself. I welcome any criticism which aids me to find out the errors which I know must exist in my poor attempts; but the criticism that is useful to a writer in this respect must begin by really trying to understand what end he is striving to attain, and what are the steps by which he proposes to attain it, and must not condemn him off-hand for differing from what the critic has accepted beforehand as the recognised view.

The example I shall here select is in *Acts* xix. 39, which is rendered in the Authorized Version, "but if ye enquire anything concerning other matters, it shall be determined in a lawful assembly," while the Revised Version has it, "but if ye seek anything about other matters,¹ it shall be settled in the regular assembly." I propose only to consider the last phrase and the discrepancy between the two versions. Two questions suggest themselves: why did the Revisers alter "a lawful assembly" into "the regular

¹ *περὶ ἑτέρων* as in the vast majority of MSS. There can, however, hardly be any hesitation in preferring *περαιτέρω* with B, confirmed by the Latin *ulterius* in Codex Bezae (where the Greek has *περὶ ἑτέρων*), and in the Stockholm old-Latin version (Gig.).

assembly,"¹ and is the alteration an improvement? The answer is by no means easy. In seeking the solution we shall see that hasty comparison of a phrase in an author with a usage in an inscription may be misleading if it is not guided by consideration of the general sense of the whole passage. In doing so we shall incidentally observe that a scholar who is simply studying the evolution of constitutional history, in the Græco-Asian cities, so far from finding any reason to distrust the accuracy of the picture of Ephesian government in this episode, discovers in it valuable evidence which is nowhere else accessible. The practical man, and the scholar who studies antiquities for their own sake, will always find *Acts* a first-hand and luminous authority. It is only the theorist (eager to find or to make support for his pet theory about the steps by which Church history developed, and annoyed that *Acts* is against him) that distrusts the author of *Acts*, and finds him inadequate, incomplete, or inaccurate. And, as Luke is so logical, complete, and "photographic" in his narrative, the only useful way of studying him is to bring practical knowledge and sense of the connexion and fitness of things to bear on him. There is no author who has suffered so much from the old method of study practised by the scholar, who sits in his library and cuts himself off from practical life and the interest in reality, and in the things of reality.

It happens that the text of the latter part of the speech, delivered by the Secretary of the State of Ephesus² to the noisy assembly in the theatre, is very doubtful; but, fortunately, the general run of the meaning and argument

¹ The Greek is ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

² The rendering "Town-clerk," or "Clerk," suggests an inadequate idea of the rank and importance of this official. Lightfoot, in the paper which we shall quote in this article (*Contemporary Review*, March, 1878, reprinted in appendix to *Essays on Supernatural Religion*), was the first properly to appreciate and emphasize this.

is quite clear. He pointed out that, (v. 38) if Demetrius and the associated guild had any ground of complaint, they had a legal means of redress before the proper court, viz. the Roman "Assizes" (*conventus*), at which the proconsul presided; ¹ (v. 39) if they sought anything further, *i.e.*, if they desired to get any resolution passed with regard to the future conduct of the citizens and of resident non-citizens ² in reference to this matter, ³ the business would be carried through ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, *i.e.*, in the public assembly meeting with powers to transact business (whereas the present meeting had no power to transact business); (v. 40) and in fact there was a serious risk that the present utterly unjustified and unjustifiable meeting should be regarded by the imperial government (*i.e.*, the proconsul primarily) as a case of riot, and should lead to stern treatment of the whole city and curtailment of its liberties and powers.

What then is the exact sense of the term ἔννομος ἐκκλησία in v. 39? Apparently the argument is this: "the present assembly is not ἔννομος, and you cannot serve your own purpose by persisting in it, for it is not qualified to pass any measure or transact any business; and therefore you should go away and take the recognised necessary steps for having your business brought before the assembly meeting as ἔννομος. But, further, the present meeting may lead to very serious consequences and to punishment which will fall heavily on the whole city, including your own selves." Consequently the whole force of the argument, compels us to treat ἡ ἔννομος ἐκκλησία as "the people duly assembled in the exercise of its powers." In the con-

¹ We note that the Secretary assumes at once that the ground of complaint is something serious. In a city like Ephesus trifling actions could be disposed of by the city magistrates; their limit of power in this respect is uncertain, but was certainly very low.

² οἱ ξένοι οἱ κατοικοῦντες, or ἐπιδημοῦντες, Acts xvii. 21.

³ I follow Page's sensible note on εἰ δέ τι περαιτέρω ζητεῖτε.

stitution of Ephesus, as a free Greek City-State (πόλις), all power ultimately resided in the Assembly of the citizens; and in the Greek period the Assembly had held in its own hands the reins of power, and exercised the final control over all departments of government. In the Roman period the Assembly gradually lost the reality of its power, for the imperial Roman administration, which had abolished the powers of the popular assembly in Rome, was naturally not disposed to regard with a favourable eye the popular assemblies of cities in the provinces. Hence meetings of the popular Assembly in Ephesus and other Asian cities tended to become mere formalities, at which the bills sent to it by the Senate of the city were approved. But, at the period in question, the Assembly of the people was still, at least in name, the supreme and final authority; and with it lay the ultimate decision on all public questions. Not merely did it continue to be mentioned along with the Senate in the preamble to all decrees passed by the City-State under the Roman Empire, as giving validity and authority;¹ it still probably retained the right to reject the decrees sent before it by the Senate.²

The term *ἐννομος ἐκκλησία* therefore embraces all meetings of the Assembly qualified to set in motion the powers resident in the People. These meetings were of two kinds: (1) stated, regular meetings held on certain regular, customary days (called *νόμιμοι ἐκκλησίαι* in an inscription of Ephesus,³ and *κυρία ἐκκλησία* at Athens); (2) extraordinary meetings held for special or pressing business (called *σύγκλητοι ἐκκλησίαι* at Athens, while the Ephesian technical term is unknown). One seems driven to the conclusion

¹ That form of preamble *ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ* continued for more than two centuries later, after it had become a mere form corresponding to no real expression of the popular will.

² At a later date it certainly lost this right, and met merely to accept the decrees.

³ Hicks, *Greek Inscriptions of the British Museum*, no. 481, l. 340.

that the intention of the Secretary was to select a term that included both regular and extraordinary meetings. What he said amounted to this, "Bring your business before a meeting that is qualified to deal with it, either taking the proper steps to have a special meeting called to discuss your business, or, if it is not so immediately urgent and you prefer the other course for any reason, bringing it after due intimation before the next ordinary, regular meeting of the People."

On this interpretation it would seem that the rendering in the Authorized Version "lawful" is correct, and that the Revisers were not well advised in substituting the term "regular." The term "regular" suggests only νόμιμοι ἐκκλησίαι and shuts out specially summoned meetings of the People, whereas the Secretary desired to use a term that should include every legal class of meetings.

Further, the Secretary seems distinctly to use the term ἔννομος ἐκκλησία in contrast to the present illegal meeting, which he styled συστροφή (*v.* 40), and which the historian calls a confused Assembly (ἐκκλησία συνεχυμένη), inasmuch as the majority did not know what was the business before the meeting (*v.* 32). This also would suggest that "lawful" is the antithesis required, and would defend the Authorized Version.

On the other hand, however, the evidence seems to be strong that ἔννομος was an equivalent but less common term for the regular ordinary Assembly (νόμιμος being far commoner); and the evidence has convinced (and rightly convinced) most scholars—Wetstein, Lightfoot, Wendt, Blass, and many others (including *Stephani Thesaurus*). In that case, apparently, we are bound to prefer the translation "regular" in *v.* 39, and the Revisers would appear to be right in altering the Authorized Version. Thus our different lines of investigation lead to opposite conclusions.

But we must bear in mind that the reasoning in the last

paragraph is founded on a distinction that belongs to a purely Greek constitutional distinction. Ephesus was no longer a Greek city. It retained indeed the external appearance of Greek city government; but the real character of the old Greek constitution was already seriously altered, and even the outward form was in some respects changed. We cannot therefore attach very great importance to an analogy with a fact of the old Greek constitutional practice until it is clearly proved, or at least made probable, that that practice remained unaffected by the Roman spirit. It is certain, indeed, that a distinction of ordinary (*νομίμους καὶ συνηθείς*) and extraordinary meetings was Roman as much as Greek; but the question must be settled how the Roman rule affected the Greek Assembly (*ἐκκλησία*) in Ephesus.

I think that the true solution is furnished by some remarks of M. Lévy in an instructive and admirable study of the constitution of the Græco-Asian cities, which he has recently published in the *Revue des Etudes Grecques*, 1895, pp. 203-255.¹ If he is right, and he seems to me to be so, we must look at the incident recorded in Acts as an episode in the gradual process, by which the central Roman administration interfered in the municipal government of these cities. As he says on p. 216, the Roman officials exercised the right themselves to summon a meeting of the Assembly whenever they pleased, and he also considers that distinct authorization by the Roman officials was required before an Assembly could be legally summoned. Now, as we have already seen, the imperial government was very jealous of the right of popular Assemblies. We

¹ While the paper, which is only the first of a promised series, enables me already to add much to the slight general sketch of the constitution of these cities given in chap. ii. of my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, it seems to me not to necessitate any change of importance in what I have said (though I should of course like now to rewrite in better form not merely that chapter, but every chapter I have ever written). [Lévy, p. 216, n. (2), read "II. 236."]

may therefore conclude with confidence that the Roman officials were unlikely to give leave for any Assembly beyond that certain regular number which was agreed upon and fixed beforehand.¹ Thus the "regular" Assemblies had come to be practically equivalent to the "lawful" Assemblies; the extraordinary Assemblies called by the officers of the city, which in the Greek period had been legal, were now disallowed and illegal; and extraordinary Assemblies were now only summoned by Roman officials. It was therefore necessary for Demetrius to wait until the next regular Assembly, before he could have any opportunity of legally bringing any business before the People.

We conclude, then, that neither the rendering of the Authorized nor that of the Revised Version is in itself actually inaccurate. But we fail to find any sufficient reason for altering a rendering which was quite good and had become familiar; and we cannot acquit the Revisers of having made the change under the influence of an inadequate conception of the constitutional facts involved.² They are in no wise to be blamed for their incomplete understanding of the facts, for the materials were not accessible to them; and until M. Lévy's masterly exposition of them, the difficulty was apparently insoluble. But none the less is it regrettable that they altered the text, for the idea of a lawfully constituted Assembly qualified to exercise the powers resident in the People is demanded

¹ Dion Chrysostom's Oration XLVIII. was delivered at Prusa in an extraordinary meeting of the Assembly (*ἐκκλησία*) held by permission of the proconsul Varenus Rufus; but we observe that (1) the elaborate compliment to the proconsul for his kindness in permitting the Assembly suggests that it was an unusual favour, (2) the business seems to have been merely complimentary and ornamental, to judge from Dion's speech; (3) the administration of Bithynia fell at the period in question into a state of great laxity (even the law against *collegia* was suffered to be violated), so that Trajan had to send Pliny on a special mission to reform the government of the province (see Hardy's *Introduction* to his edition of Pliny, pp. 24, 48).

² We may understand that they would not have made a change, unless they had considered that "lawful" was distinctly incorrect.

here by the logic of the passage as a whole, and is perhaps better expressed by the word "lawful." In fact, it would appear that the Secretary was not at the moment thinking of the technical distinction between ordinary and extraordinary meetings. Had he been thinking of that distinction, he would have used the technical term *νόμιμος*, which seems naturally to have risen to the lips of an Ephesian when that distinction was prominent in his thought. Thus in the inscription already quoted,¹ it is provided that a statue of Athena, as patroness of education and all arts, dedicated to Artemis and to the rising generations of Ephesus in future times, should be brought into every ordinary meeting of the People (*κατὰ πᾶσαν νόμιμον ἐκκλησίαν*). The extraordinary meetings are here excepted from the provision recorded in this inscription, either because they were hastily summoned and time did not permit of the necessary preparations for bringing the statue, or because they were only summoned by Roman officials, and were not in the same strict sense voluntary meetings of the Ephesian People exercising its own powers.

We naturally proceed to enquire whether the new light thrown by M. Lévy on the circumstances of this Ephesian meeting help to solve the difficulty of the reading in *v.* 40, in which Westcott and Hort consider "some primitive error probable." In that sentence the Secretary proceeds to forecast the possible future, with a view to intimidate the disorderly assemblage and induce them to disperse quietly. In forming an opinion as to the text, therefore, we must, in the first place, endeavour on our own part to forecast the possible sequence of events. As M. Lévy says, the Roman administration had the power to prohibit indefinitely the right of holding meetings of the People; and it depended solely on their goodwill when they should allow a city to resume the right, after it had once been

¹ Hicks, no. 481, l. 340.

prohibited. The occurrence of this large meeting in the theatre might be looked into by the Roman officials. It had not been authorized by them; and the city would have some difficulty in explaining satisfactorily its origin. The only explanation that could be accepted would consist in showing that some serious cause had existed for the unusual occurrence. It is then natural that the Secretary, when representing to the assemblage the danger which they were incurring, should point out that when the Roman administration investigated the case, it would not be possible to assign any cause which could justify the concourse. His oration, as actually delivered, undoubtedly emphasized this point at some length, and pressed home the danger of the situation; for this is the climax and peroration of the speech, which was so efficacious as to calm the excited crowd, and induce them to retire peaceably; and nothing but fear was likely to calm the rage of an Ionian city. But in the brief report that has come down to us the peroration has been compressed into one single sentence (v. 40); and the sentence, which describes the probable investigation and the want of any sufficient plea in defence, has become obscure through the attempt to say a great deal in a few words. The stages of the future are thus sketched out: there is likely to be an investigation and charge of riotous conduct (*κινδυνεύομεν ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως*) arising out of to-day's assembly (*περὶ τῆς σήμερον*);¹ we shall be required to furnish an explanation of the concourse to the Romans, whose maxim is "*divide to command*" and who are always jealous of meetings that bear in any way on

¹ Blass understands *περὶ τῆς σήμερον* (*ἐκκλησίας*). Page and Meyer-Wendt understand *περὶ τῆς σήμερον* (*ἡμέρας*), and Page compares xx. 26. The ultimate sense is not affected by the difference. Personally, I should follow Blass, whose understanding of the words gives a much more effective and Lukan turn to the thought; but the Bezan Reviser evidently agreed with Page. See below, under (3.)

politics or government (λόγον ἀποδοῦναι περὶ τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης); no sufficient reason exists by mentioning which¹ we shall be able to explain the origin of the meeting satisfactorily (μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὑπάρχοντος περὶ οὗ δυνησόμεθα λόγον ἀποδοῦναι).

Here we have, in the text of the inferior MSS., a logical and complete summary of the future, stated in a form that can be construed easily, even though brevity has made the expression a little harsh.² On the other hand, the great MSS. give a reading³ which cannot be accepted for the following reasons:—(1) We observe that those warm defenders of the great MSS., Westcott and Hort, with their great knowledge of Lukan style, consider it to involve a corruption; and most people will come to the same conclusion.

(2) The only possible construction of this text connects μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὑπάρχοντος with the preceding clause κινδυνεύομεν . . . σήμερον; but, as we have seen, the logic of the speech connects the thought involved in these words with the following clause.

(3) It is clear that the Bezan Reviser (whom we believe to have been at work in the work in the second century) had before him the text of the inferior MSS., and in his usual style he modified it to avoid some of the harshness of the original, κινδυνεύομεν σήμερον ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως, μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὄντος περὶ οὗ δυνησόμεθα ἀποδοῦναι λόγον τῆς συστροφῆς ταύτης.

¹ This use of *περὶ* approximates closely to the common sense "as regards," or "with reference to" (*quod attinet ad*), as in some of the examples quoted in the lexicons. Compare *ad* in Tertullian, *Apol.*, 25. Blass seems to hold that the sense is, "since there exists no charge, concerning which we shall be able to frame a defence" (which conveys no clear idea to me).

² The harshness arises chiefly from the sense of *περὶ οὗ*, (*with reference to which cause* we may render an explanation of the concurrence), immediately before *περὶ τῆς συστροφῆς*, where the preposition has a different sense. The Bezan Reviser felt the awkwardness, and modified the sentence to avoid the second occurrence of *περὶ*. See below, under (3).

³ *περὶ οὗ οὐ δυνησόμεθα, κτλ.*

(4) The corruption in the great MSS. is easily explained : there was a natural temptation to get the form " we shall not be able to explain this concourse," and this was readily attained by doubling two letters, reading *περὶ οὐ οὐ δυνησόμεθα*. We find that the same fault occurs in two other places in this scene : one letter *η* is doubled in vv. 28 and 34 so as to produce the reading *μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις*, where, as I have elsewhere¹ argued, the Bezan reading *μεγάλη Ἄρτεμις* coincides with a characteristic formula of invocation, and deserves preference.

(5) If we follow the authority of the great MSS., and read *περὶ οὐ οὐ*, Meyer-Wendt's former suggestion² that *μηδενὸς αἰτίου ὑπάρχοντος* was placed by the author after *συστροφῆς ταύτης* and got transposed to its present position would give a sense and logical connexion such as we desire ; but it involves the confession that all MSS. are wrong. Moreover, the text of the inferior MSS. and the Bezan reading cannot be derived from it by any natural process.

Thus we find ourselves obliged to prefer the reading of the inferior MSS. to that of the great MSS., and in my *St. Paul the Traveller* it is urged in several other cases that the same preference is forced on us by the logical connexion of thought.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ *Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 135 f.; *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 279.

² In the latest edition they coincide with Page's construction, which gives sense, but which (as above implied) we must, with Westcott and Hort, reject as not of Lukan style, and as illogical. It would, however, give much the same ultimate meaning as that which we get from the inferior MSS.

OFFICERS.

THE officers of the children of Israel, mentioned in Exodus v. as being under the taskmasters of Pharaoh, are called *shoterim*. Now *satara* is "to write" in Arabic, and the *shoterim* are simply mentioned as if they were elders or heads of clans. Yet, if the circumstances be well considered, they were really scribes, for the Septuagint calls them in all the passages, whether in the Pentateuch, in Joshua, or in Chronicles, *γραμματεῖς*; the taskmasters are in LXX. *ἐργοδιῶκται*, "work-drivers." The sense attached by the Septuagint translators may be judged of from the Athenian *γραμματεῖς*. These were certainly scribes who were appointed by the senate to keep the public records and the decrees passed by the public assembly, as well as to deliver the decrees of the senate to the six Thesmothetæ or legislators who sat in the supreme council, presided over by the archons. The scribes at Rome kept the public accounts, copied out laws, and recorded the proceedings of the public functionaries. They formed companies of ten, and were employed by the quæstor, or treasurer; by the ædiles, who had charge of temples, streets, and public buildings; and by the prætors, who, in the absence of the consul, governed the city, or led the army, as the case might be.

On account of the elliptical character of the Hebrew histories, which never profess to give a complete and exhaustive narrative, the *shoterim* disappear after the time of the Pentateuch and of Joshua till they occur again in the Books of Chronicles. Still without change the word "officers" is used in the English translations.¹ The Septuagint, however, holds to the word scribe, *γραμματεῖς*, or else the verb *γραμματεύειν* is used—act as a scribe. The reason would be

¹ The Bishops' Bible has "overseers" in Chronicles.

twofold. The translators residing at Alexandria would be familiar with the office and duties of scribes in Greek cities. They would also be aware that *shatar* meant to write as a verb, and scribe as a noun. The Syriac rendering shows that this was the case, for it is *sofro*, the same with the Hebrew ספר, *sefer*, book. This is sufficient proof that *shatar*, so favourite a word in the Pentateuch, really means scribe, though translated officer. The versions of Aquila, about A.D. 120, and of Symmachus, with the Samaritan, also favour the name scribe. In Numbers xvi. *shoterim* are among the seventy elders who were appointed by Divine command, and who received a portion of the Spirit of God in order that they might be competent to share the work of Moses in judging causes. In Deuteronomy xvi. 18 Israel is commanded to appoint judges and officers in every city throughout all the tribes, that they might judge the people with righteous judgment. When Israel went out to fight, it was these officers who were commanded to announce to the faint-hearted that they should not proceed to the battlefield for fear of spreading the contagion of fear. They also proclaimed that the newly married, and those who had recently built a house, or planted a vineyard, were excused from service in the army. In Joshua the *shoterim* are staff officers who communicate the orders of the general to the army on its march. They helped in the passage of the Jordan, telling the people to follow the ark at a distance of 2,000 feet. Having such information regarding the *shoterim* and their duties, we read with great interest in 1 Chronicles that in chap. xxvi. 29 they were Levites appointed in the cities of Israel to manage in conjunction with the judges, who were also Levites, matters belonging not to the temple, but to outward business. Both judges and officers were of the family of Izhar, whose elder brother was Amram, the father of Moses and Aaron. Both the judges (*shofetim*) and the officers (*shoterim*) were Levites in the time of King

David. We are told in 1 Chronicles xxiii. 4 that, while there were 24,000 Levites to oversee the work of the house of the Lord, there were 6,000 officers and judges. These 6,000 magistrates were the old scribes of Egyptian days, who by legislative changes have become limited to the tribe of Levi. This we learn from the rich genealogical stores of the first book of Chronicles. That is a post-exilic book made up from records taken to Babylon at the captivity. The King of Babylon and his officers prized books, and were glad to have them go, because libraries were one of the fundamental institutions of the Babylonish monarchy. For two thousand years they had been students of books. The book of Daniel tells us of what a noble eloquence the Chaldee language was capable as the result of these long continued studies in astronomical science and rhetoric. Palestine, too, was a land where genealogy had been assiduously cultivated. The tribal constitution, the Levitical laws and family pride, were concurring causes which forced the people to pay great attention to their genealogies. The Chronicles are in large part made up of genealogical histories, partly royal and partly belonging to the chief families of Israel, especially the Levites. This explains the allusions to the officers or *shoterim* in 1 Chronicles. So great are the historical omissions of the Hebrew Bible, that the *shoterim* are mentioned nowhere in Judges, in the books of Samuel and Kings, or in the Prophets. Only once in Proverbs vi. 7 does the word occur: "Go to the ant, thou sluggard; consider her ways, and be wise: which having no judge, officer,¹ or ruler, provideth her meat in the summer, and gathereth her food in the harvest." At that time the scribes of ancient times had become officers, and another class of scribes had grown up in Israel whose name is allied etymologically to the word *sepher*, book. The new scribes of the time of the Hagiographa were "book-men."

¹ Bishops' Bible, "governor." In A. V. and R. V., "overseer."

The old scribes of the Egyptian domination were officers or overseers.

In the New Testament in the Sermon on the Mount we have the *shofetim* and the *shoterim* mentioned again by our Lord himself. The *κριτής* is the *shofet*, and the *ὑπηρέτης* is the *shoter*. "Lest the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, Thou shalt by no means come out thence till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing." Great severity marked the administration of the provincial courts of Palestine in the time of our Lord. The judge and the officer are both here. It is the same court of twenty-three that had so long existed in the land.

JOSEPH EDKINS.

THE THEOLOGY OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

WHEN we compare the theology of the Fourth Gospel with that of the others, there are three passages in the Synoptic Gospels that attract especial attention, and are often referred to in this connexion. They are Matthew xi. 25-30, "At that time Jesus answered," etc.; Matthew xiii. 16, 17, "But blessed are your eyes, for they see," etc.; Luke x. 21-24, "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit," etc.

The tone of these passages bears a striking resemblance to that of the Fourth Gospel, and they are often cited as showing that the theology of the Synoptics is, after all, the same as the Johannine. This, however, is not exactly what they prove. The very fact that they are so unanimously selected for comparison with the Fourth Gospel shows that their resemblance to it is peculiar to them, and distinguishes them from the other Synoptic matter. They are apparently fragments derived from some earlier source, different from those which supplied the rest of the Synoptic material, and

more nearly related to the thought of the Fourth Gospel. These fragments then, and the larger whole of which they no doubt formed part, must have been in existence before the composition of the First and Third Gospels, and therefore, in all probability, before the composition of the Fourth. If so, they show us that the peculiar theology of the Fourth Gospel did not originate with the writer. He represented a school of thought which was in existence, at any rate, before the First and Third Gospels were compiled.

It is worth noticing that the resemblance which the three passages just mentioned bear to the Fourth Gospel is a resemblance of thought, not of language. Their language is very distinct from the language of the Fourth Gospel, as the note at the foot of this page shows.¹ The language and style, therefore, of the writer of the Fourth Gospel may have been entirely his own, though the theology was not peculiar to him.

JOHN A. CROSS.

SURVEY OF RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

INTRODUCTION.—The late Dr. Hort's literary executors have been well advised in publishing his *Prolegomena to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans and the Ephesians*. Readers will agree with them in believing that "so far as they go, they clearly form an invaluable contribution to the study of these Epistles." Certainly this is so; conspicuously so in regard to the *Ephesians*. There was room for a thorough investigation of the difficulties which are still felt, and have recently been expressed, regarding the peculiarities of this Epistle. And here these difficulties are dis-

¹ The following eighteen words and expressions which occur in these passages—viz., Matthew xi. 25-30, xiii. 16, 17; Luke x. 21-24—are not found in the Fourth Gospel: ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, κύριος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, σοφός, συνετός, ἀποκρύπτω, νήπιος, εὐδοκία, ἐπιγιγνώσκειν, ἀναπαύω, ζυγός, πραῦς, ταπεινός, ἀνάπαυσις, χρηστός, φορτίον, ἐλαφρός. Ἀποκαλύπτω, which occurs four times in Matthew and five times in Luke, does not occur in the Fourth Gospel except once in a quotation from the LXX. (xii. 38).

cussed by an independent scholar familiar with New Testament literature. The spirit in which his investigation is made, and the reasonableness of his conclusions, cannot but carry great weight. Exception may be taken to the statement that in this Epistle "for the first time, we hear Christians throughout the world described as together making up a single Ecclesia." This unity is implied in several expressions used by St. Paul at earlier dates. But everywhere in these Prolegomena there is evidence that the writer has read the Epistles with his own eyes, forming his own judgment on material gathered by himself.

Another excellent book in this department is Dr. Paton J. Gloag's *Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels* (T. & T. Clark). This volume completes a series of Introductions to the several sections of the New Testament upon which Dr. Gloag has been engaged for many years. There was crying need of a manual which should present the results of recent criticism on the Synoptic Gospels. Much attention has been given to them, and with some definite results; but for the most part the work and opinion of critics can only be learnt by searching through numerous periodicals. Dr. Gloag's Introduction is therefore timely, and it is also competent. A clear statement is given of the actual position of criticism, and some useful contributions are made towards the solution of the problems that remain. The closing paragraph of Mark is defended, a full account of the difficulty about Quirinius is given, and the two genealogies are carefully examined. Dr. Gloag assigns the Muratorian Fragment to a much earlier date than is now usually adopted; and to the commentaries he mentions he should certainly have added Broadus on Matthew and Hahn on Luke.

The brilliant volume of Prof. W. M. Ramsay on *St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen* will receive in these pages elaborate treatment at the competent hands of Prof. Sanday, and all that needs now be done is to call attention to this most welcome addition to the literature of the New Testament. It is important to have the testimony of an expert to the authenticity of the Book of Acts; it is also important to have Prof. Ramsay's opinion on difficulties of interpretation; but essentially the advance which this volume makes is that after reading it we can never return to our old attitude towards the scenes recorded in *Acts*, but must ever after remain in a new and clearer atmosphere.

Imagination is permanently quickened and informed. The essential element in Prof. Ramsay's book cannot be touched by showing him to be wrong in this or that interpretation.

Under the head of Introduction may be mentioned two small manuals of New Testament Greek: *Essentials of New Testament Greek*, by John H. Huddilston, of Northwestern University (Macmillan & Co.), and *An Introduction to the Study of New Testament Greek*, by James Hope Moulton, M.A., late fellow of King's College, Cambridge (Charles H. Kelly). Both these volumes are handy and excellently printed, and may be confidently recommended to any one who wishes to acquire sufficient Greek to read his New Testament. They differ in plan and contents, Mr. Moulton's being simply a grammar under the ordinary divisions of Accidence and Syntax, while Mr. Huddilston's book consists of two parts, of which the first contains graduated lessons in reading, with accompanying grammatical explanations, and the second the grammar in full. In both manuals the Syntax is necessarily and confessedly meagre, suggesting the question, Why should a New Testament scholar spend so much trouble on preparing a new Accidence? Why can the pupil not avail himself of any of the multitude of Greek grammars already published? In Mr. Huddilston's manual there are mistranslations on pp. 213 and 217. And in Mr. Moulton's (p. 25) allusion is made to a time "when the language was ceasing to be a spoken tongue"; and in regard to accents he advises that they "ought to be totally ignored in the first stages of Greek study," which directly contradicts the advice given by Prof. Chandler.

In *Philo and Holy Scripture* Prof. Ryle has collected all the quotations of the Old Testament which occur in Philo, and has printed them in full. These quotations in the first place assist in the ascertainment of the Septuagint text; but also they shed light on Philo's attitude to Scripture, and on the comparative esteem in which the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa were held in his day. The volume therefore will be prized as radiating light in many directions, and Prof. Ryle will enjoy, as the reward of his labour, the consciousness of saving many a scholar much drudgery. The publishers are Messrs. Macmillan & Co.

EXEGESIS.—To the *International Critical Commentary* there has been added *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, by the Rev. William Sanday, D.D., LL.D., and the

Rev. Arthur C. Headlam, B.D. (T. & T. Clark). These names are guarantees for conscientious and thorough work; and of carelessness there is no trace in this volume. The advance made upon previous commentaries on the same Epistle is to be found especially in the Introduction, the brief historical notices which are here and there interpolated, the exploitation of the Jewish Apocalyptic and Rabbinic literature, and the constant reference to modern German monographs and articles bearing on the subject in hand. In these respects this commentary stands alone and makes itself indispensable in all future study of the Epistle. The amount of material in these departments gathered into its pages reflects praise on the industry, scholarship, and judgment of its authors. The theological notes or brief essays are of use rather as furnishing part of the material necessary for forming decisions than as exemplifying the firm and conclusive treatment of old problems. The authors, multifarious and exact as their reading has been, seem rather to have shrunk from Puritan literature; yet there is none so Pauline. But what we find in this commentary is so valuable that it little becomes us to complain of what we miss.

The New Testament Series of the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges is completed by the publication of Mr. A. E. Humphreys' volume on *The Epistles to Timothy and Titus*. Mr. Humphreys treats very fully the questions raised by critics regarding the authenticity of these Epistles, and furnishes a convenient survey of all introductory matters. The Commentary is informative and exact.

Messrs. Macmillan & Co. issue in an attractive form *The Acts of the Apostles, with Introduction and Notes*, by T. E. Page, M.A., and A. S. Walpole, M.A. In his racy preface Mr. Page explains that this is an adaptation of his notes on the 'Greek text of Acts for the use of English readers. The Authorized Version is printed on the upper part of the page, and those who have consulted his previously published volume do not need to be assured of the excellence of the Notes. Serviceable maps are added, and a glossary of Old English words, and an index, complete a book which will admirably serve its purpose, whether in schools or in private.

EXPOSITION.—An excellent specimen of popular exposition is furnished in Dr. James Stalker's *The Two St. Johns of the New*

Testament (Isbister & Co.). St. John the Apostle and St. John the Baptist are treated separately; and although Dr. Stalker justifies their collocation, he really gives us two books in one, for which, as both are good, we should be doubly thankful. In an animated and easy style which effectually holds the attention, Dr. Stalker follows up all hints given in the New Testament narrative regarding the character and career of these two grand figures, and nowhere can one follow their steps more pleasantly than in his pages.

Among expository books may also be reckoned Canon Bernard's *Songs of the Holy Nativity* (Macmillan & Co.). The author intends his work to be helpful, both as an exposition of an interesting portion of Scripture, and as an aid to intelligent devotion in the congregational use of the evangelic Canticles. Certainly he has furnished us with a most careful exposition, characterized by fineness of perception and soundness of judgment. In giving some account of the sources Canon Bernard advocates the opinion that while St. Paul was imprisoned at Cæsarea, St. Luke was making enquiries preparatory to writing his Gospel.

The Expositor's Bible is nearing its close, and certainly shows no symptom of diminished vigour in its contributors. The most recent volume is that on *Deuteronomy*, by Prof. Harper, of Melbourne, and is eminently worthy of being fetched from the Antipodes. Kingsley used to say, "I hold Deuteronomy to be the sum and substance of all political philosophy and morality, of the true life of a nation." Evidently Prof. Harper is of the same mind, for out of it he brings lessons for all time in social, domestic, and political morality. The firm certainty with which he handles moral questions is a characteristic of the book which all readers will appreciate. Continually there occur passages of great beauty, wise thinking, coloured and vivified with historical illustrations drawn from a wide field and applied with admirable effect. His treatment of Puritanism in its three types—Spenser, Hutchinson, and Milton—his chapter on marriage, his pathetic lament over the decay of reverence for parents, and other passages of like nature, reveal a mind that has closely studied the ethical aspects of life, both in its national and individual manifestations. Equally valuable, if not so universally attractive, will be found the critical portion of the book. Candour, caution,

and sanity characterize Prof. Harper's criticism. The only chapter in which we could have desired and expected more than we get is that on "Old Testament Sacrifice and Christianity." What is given in that chapter is as instructive as every other part of the volume, and sacrifice is so large and variously-attached a subject that perhaps it is not fair to complain of the omission of certain aspects of the great theme; yet one cannot but wish that a critic and theologian so at home in Old Testament teaching should more fully and explicitly have told us what light he finds in sacrifice for the understanding of the death of Christ.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.—Prof. Briggs has followed up his *Messiah of the Gospels* with a still more elaborate volume on the *Messiah of the Apostles* (T. and T. Clark). With a painstaking scholarship most worthy of recognition he examines every passage in the New Testament which has a bearing on Christology. This investigation has been carried through with praiseworthy candour. "He has made every effort to see the Messiah as He appeared to each writer in each separate writing." He recognizes that this brings him to results which do not exactly correspond with the familiar teaching of systematic theologians, although perhaps the difference is not quite so great as he imagines. At any rate he has given us a most serviceable book, which will be of great value to all who attempt to go over the same ground. The care which Prof. Briggs has spent upon the work will be understood from this one fact among others of similar significance that before gathering testimonies from the Book of Revelation he felt himself called upon to construct for himself a theory of the composition of the book. Plainly Dr. Briggs has not grudged toil. The book is a storehouse of material.

Another notable contribution to New Testament theology is Prof. Beet's *The New Life in Christ* (Hodder and Stoughton), which is a continuation of his previous volume *Through Christ to God*. The former was a study in scientific theology, while the present publication professes to be a study in personal religion. This distinction, however, may mislead; for the present volume is quite as scientific as the previous, and indeed, being occupied with such problems as predestination and human freedom, it is necessarily philosophical, at least in part. It takes to do with the appropria-

tion of salvation and discusses man's condition as a sinner, the new life to which he is called by Christ, the relation of the human will to grace, and the final rest of man in God. Prof. Beet thinks that the inward manifestation of Christianity has received too little attention, regarding which opinion nothing need be said, as it has prompted the production of this excellent volume. It is a book from which even one reading will derive information, but which will stand, and reward, close study. It admirably supplements the ordinary systematic theology and its close dependence on Scripture gives it an element of instructiveness and certainty.

The Saviour in the Newer Light, by Alexander Robinson, B.D., Kilmun (Messrs. William Blackwood & Sons), is a life of our Lord based upon a critical reconstruction of the gospel narrative. Mr. Robinson endeavours to eliminate from the documents whatever is unhistorical and to reach the very truth regarding the words, acts, and spirit of Jesus. This is a necessary work, although scarcely so difficult as Mr. Robinson finds it. He enters on his task with much confidence and with some insight and competence, but his work is greatly marred by precipitancy. He prejudices his readers also by his preface, in which he poses as the representative of "The Mature Life of Modern Biblical Criticism," and of "modern thoughtfulness." This really is hardly fair to modern thoughtfulness; and even slenderly equipped scholars may determine whether modern Biblical criticism and its maturest decisions can truly be said to be represented by one who affirms that the Baptist spoke of our Lord as the "only begotten Son"; that the discourses in the Fourth Gospel are "in complete contradiction to everything about Jesus in the earlier Gospels"; that that Gospel "has been by modern criticism hurled down irrevocably from the high pedestal on which piety used to set it"; that the death of Jesus occurred in the year 35 A.D. Mr. Robinson's critical sagacity may be measured by the jumble he makes of the notes of time in the Fourth Gospel; by his putting into the lips of Jesus the words "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom"; by his grotesque account of the miracles; and by his throughout mistaking subjective predilections and fancies for substantial critical grounds. His English style, too, would stand amendment. Frequent awkwardnesses occur, such as this: "I appeal from having it admitted that this state of matters must prevail in regard to the ministry of the Church of Scotland." The "state of matters" here com-

plained of is that ministers of that church should be required to hold Trinitarian doctrine. That is for the Church of Scotland to determine. Here it is enough to say that in our judgment Mr. Robinson has to a large extent wasted ability and knowledge with which he might have accomplished excellent work had he built upon sounder foundations.

Messrs. Simpkin, Marshall & Co. have issued a second edition of Mr. Hampden Cook's essay, to prove that the Second Advent is an event of the past. It is entitled *The Christ has Come*; and it is well worth reading.

Dr. De Witt Hyde's *Outlines of Social Theology* (Macmillan & Co.) is one of the brightest, freshest, most suggestive theological essays of the present generation.

MISCELLANEOUS.—One of the most beautifully produced books of the year is *Passages of the Bible Chosen for their Literary Beauty and Interest*, by J. G. Frazer, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge (Adam & Charles Black). No one will complain of the taste with which these selections are made, and possibly some persons may be induced to read the Bible in this form who would not read it in any other. The purely literary excellence of the Bible is undoubtedly here exhibited in a very convincing manner. Mr. Frazer's notes are of great excellence, and the volume is in all respects most desirable.

A cheaper edition of *The Master's Guide for His Disciples* is issued by Mr. Elliot Stock. This is a manual of all the recorded sayings of Jesus arranged for easy consultation and systematic reading. On the appearance of the first edition it was strongly recommended in these pages, a recommendation which after further use can be cordially renewed. This new edition, although cheaper, is very pretty.

The Clarendon Press publishes the first part of what promises to be an excellent *Old Testament History* for Junior Classes by the Rev. T. H. Stokoe, D.D. Its plan is to give one selection for each week of the school year with explanatory and illustrative comments. The selections are linked to one another by carefully written abstracts of the intervening history. This plan commends itself, and it is successfully carried out.

Mr. Robert Bird, author of *Jesus the Carpenter of Nazareth*, has just published with Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. another book of the same kind—*Joseph the Dreamer*. It is likely to prove

as popular as the previous volume. Mr. Bird successfully weaves into his narrative threads of information which lend colour and picturesqueness to the story. Children listen to it open-eyed.

The Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund have issued a small volume (Macmillan's Eversley Series) of *Historical Essays* by the late Bishop of Durham. These essays are mainly on two periods, and describe Christian life in the second and third centuries, and England during the latter half of the thirteenth century. They everywhere reveal the touch of the trained historical scholar, and, perhaps better than anything else that has been written by Bishop Lightfoot, reveal his capacity for sustained historical narrative.

The Established Church of Scotland is issuing, through Messrs. A. & C. Black, a series of "Guild Text-Books" which deserve to be widely used. The most recent of these is *The English Bible: a Sketch of its History*, by the Rev. George Milligan, B.D. This is both an interesting book to read and a good text-book for class purposes. It is packed with information, and yet retains literary excellence.—*Our Lord's Teaching*, by Rev. James Robertson, D.D., Whittingehame, is another of the series, and is a book of great excellence, clear, serious, weighty, wise in its thinking, thoroughly well-digested, and written in a lucid and attractive style. The difficult points, such as the Death of Christ, are treated in a manner that indicates knowledge and judgment. This series has so commended itself that the editors have judged it advisable to issue the volumes in an enlarged edition. Of these, there has appeared *The Religions of the World*, by Principal Grant, of Queen's College, Kingston. Any reader who seeks a thoroughly well-informed and sympathetic account of the great religions could scarcely do better than consult this pleasantly written book.

MARGUS DODS.

ON AN ANTE-NICENE HOMILY OF GREGORY THAUMATURGUS.

NOTE OF TRANSLATOR (F. C. CONYBEARE).

[THE following Armenian homily of Gregory Thaumaturgus was printed for the first time in the journal called *Ararat*, of the convent of Etschmiadzin, for September, 1895. It is unknown in Greek. The text so printed, and here translated, is contained in an old book of homilies in the Etschmiadzin library. It is also found in a MS. of San Lazaro, Djarrentir, No. 3; but apparently without title.

It is quite in the style of the other homilies ascribed to this father. These are by some (*e.g.*, Harnack, *Altchristliche Literatur bis Eusebius*, p. 431) accounted spurious. Why I cannot understand; for they are found, whether in Greek, or in Syriac, or in Armenian, with the constant ascription to this Gregory. Why should a later age have forged an entire series of homilies and ascribed them to him? ¹ If they were *Tentenzschriften*, *i.e.*, homilies written with a certain and marked doctrinal bias of some kind, their forgery would be intelligible. But they cannot be accused of being this. They are just the pious and rather rhetorical outpourings of a devout and simple mind.

This homily may therefore be accepted as an example of the Pulpit eloquence of this Gregory. About the middle of the third century it must have stirred some congregation in Neo-Cæsarea. It is very florid, and in its refrains more like a hymn than a sermon. To a modern reader it must needs appear a rather tawdry effort. But the image of Christ as Spring in § 26 in a measure redeems the whole piece, and some other thoughts as well are prettily worked out.

¹ The use of the epithet *θεόροκος* is not inconsistent with this description; for Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory's contemporary, already used it.

The Armenian is often obscure, and contains several compounds not otherwise known. I have rendered it quite literally. It was made from Greek. For convenience I have broken it up into sections, adding in square brackets the few words required here and there to make grammar or sense.—F. C. C.]

THE HOMILY OF ST. GREGORY THE WONDER-WORKER,
CONCERNING THE HOLY MOTHER OF GOD, EVER-VIRGIN.

1. When I remember the disobedience of Eve, I weep. But when I view the fruit of Mary, I am again renewed. Deathless by descent, invisible through beauty, before the ages light of light; of God the Father wast Thou begotten; being Word and Son of God, Thou didst take on flesh from Mary Virgin, in order that Thou mightest renew afresh Adam fashioned by Thy holy hand.

2. Holy, deathless, eternal, inaccessible, without change, without turn, True Son of God art Thou before the ages; yet wast pleased to be conceived and formed in the womb of the Holy Virgin, in order that Thou mightest make alive once more man first fashioned by Thy holy hand, but dead through sin.

3. By the good pleasure Thou didst issue forth, by the good pleasure and will of the invisible Father. Wherefore we all invoke Thee, calling Thee King. Be Thou our succour; Thou that wast born of the Virgin and wrapt in swaddling clothes and laid in the manger, and wast suckled by Mary; to the end that Thou mightest make alive once more the first-created Adam that was dead through sin.

4. Feasted with knowledge from the Divine knowledge, let us emit like a fountain the sweetly sounding hymns of praise; let us glorify the sweet powers of the Divine Word. With sweetly sounding doctrine let us send forth praise worthy of the Divine grace; forasmuch as earth, and sea, and all created things, visible and invisible, bless and

glorify God's love for man; for that His majesty was among [us]. For being God He appeared in the flesh, and taking on Himself extreme humility, was born of the Holy Virgin, to the end that He might renew afresh him that was dead through disobedience.

5. Turn ye, O congregations, and come. Let us all praise Him that is born of the Virgin. For that being the glory and image before the ages of the Godhead, He yet became a fellow-sufferer with us of poverty. Being the exceeding magnificent power [and] image of God, He took on the form of a slave. He that putteth on the light as a garment, consorted with men as one that is vile. He that is hymned by cherubim and by myriad angels, as a citizen on earth doth He live.¹ He that being before (all) maketh all creation alive, was born of the Holy Virgin, in order that He might make alive once more the first created.

6. Christ our God took on [Himself] to begin life as man (*lit.* the beginning of humanity), being yet a sharer of the [life] without beginning of God the Father; in order to lift up unto the beginningless beginning of the Godhead man that was fallen.

7. And He took the form of a slave from the Holy Virgin, in order to call us up to the glorified dominical image. He put on the outward shape made of clay, that He might make [us] sharers of the heavenly form. He sat in the lap of the Holy Virgin, that He might place us on the right hand in the intimacy of His Father. In a vile body was He; and by means of the same He was laid in a tomb, that He might manifest us heirs of eternal life. In the womb of the Holy Virgin was He, the incomprehensible (*or* inaccessible) one, confined; in order that He might renew the Adam destroyed through sin.

8. Power of the Father and living font, Christ our God, [He] is the life-fraught mystery, in whom even through

¹ = πολιτεύεται.

[His] living voice we believed ; life without end He freely bestows on those who hope in Him, and with the Spirit of grace He illumines the races of men. From this fountain, living and ever-flowing and of sweet taste, who-soever in faith are athirst are filled and sated.

9. Wherefore even with one voice [let us sing the praises] of God the Word, that according to the worthiness of each is cause and promoter of salvation, unto young men and old, and unto children and women. For from Mary, the divine fountain of the ineffable Godhead, gushes forth grace and free gift of the Holy Spirit. From a single Holy Virgin the Pearl of much price proceeded, in order to make alive once more the first-created man that was dead through sin.

10. He is the Sun of Righteousness, dawning upon earth ; and in the fashion of a man He deigned to come unto our race. Having hidden in the coarse matter of humanity the effulgent splendour of His Godhead, and having filled [us] with the Divine Spirit, He hath also made us worthy to sing unto Him the angelic hymn of praise.

11. Let us twine, as with a wreath, the souls (*or* selves) [of them that love the festival and love to hearken]¹ with golden blossoms, fain to be crowned with wreaths from the unfading gardens ; and offering in our hands the fair-fruited flowers of Christ, let us gather [them]. For the God-like temple of the Holy Virgin is meet to be glorified with such a crown ; because the illumining Pearl cometh forth, to the end that it may raise up again into the ever-streaming light them that were gone down into darkness and the shadow of death.

12. Regaled with the medicine (*lit.* poison) of the Divine words of Christ unto the grace of the same, let us send up unto Him some worthy hymn. Let us hasten to gather up

¹ These words are added in brackets in the Armenian text.

the fruits of the mystery of immortality. Let us hasten to inhale the perfume of the God-clad symmetry (*or* harmony). In [our] language let us luxuriate in the Divine grace, and let us hasten to drive away from us the foul odour of sin. Let us rather clothe us in the sweet savour of the works of righteousness. Having put on ourselves the breastplate of faith, and the garb of a virtuous life, and the holy and spotless raiment of purity, let us fast (*or*? keep guard). For He is excellence, and hath His dwelling with peace, and is yoke-fellow of love and consorteth [therewith]; a blossom smelling of hope. And the lambs which in faith browse upon this shoot forth the light-like rod of the Trinity. But we, O my friends, resorting to the garden of the Saviour, let us praise the Holy Virgin; saying along with the angels in the language of Divine grace, "Rejoice thou and be glad." For from her first shone forth the eternally radiant light, that lighteth us with its goodness.

13. The Holy Virgin is herself both an honourable temple of God and a shrine made pure, and a golden altar of whole burnt offerings. By reason of her surpassing purity [she is] the Divine incense of oblation ($=\pi\rho\theta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$), and oil of the holy grace, and a precious vase bearing in itself the true nard; [yea and] the priestly diadem revealing the good pleasure of God, whom she alone approacheth holy in body and soul. [She is] the door which looks eastward, and by the comings in and goings forth the whole earth is illuminated. The fertile olive from which the Holy Spirit took the fleshly slip (*or* twig) of the Lord, and saved the suffering race of men. She is the boast of virgins, and the joy of mothers; the declaration of archangels, even as it was spoken: "Be thou glad and rejoice, the Lord with thee"; and again, "from thee"; in order that He may make new once more the dead through sin.

14. Thou didst allow her to remain a virgin, and wast pleased, O Lord, to lie in the Virgin's womb, sending in advance the archangel to announce it [to her]. But he from above, from the ineffable hosts, came unto Mary, and first heralded to her the tidings: "Be thou glad and rejoice." And he also added, "The Lord with thee. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." But she was in tumult, and pondered in her mind what sort of tidings was this. But then in seemly fashion, I ween, the grace chose out the Holy Virgin; for she was wise in all ways, nor was there her like among women of all nations.

15. Not as the first virgin did she, being alone in the garden, with loose and effeminate thought accept the advice of the serpent and destroy the thought of her heart; through whom came all the toil and sorrow of the saint. But such was the Holy Virgin that by her the former's transgressions also were rectified. Nor, like Sarah, when she had good tidings that she would bear a son, did she rashly laugh; nor like Rebekah, who, with the temper of a deserter, accepted the ornaments, and willingly gave water to drink unto the camels of her betrothed. And unlike all other women, she did not accept the grace of greeting indiscreetly (*or without testing it*), but only through thought bright and clear (*or through glittering thought*).

16. Whence then dost thou bring with thee to us such a blessing? and [out] of what treasure-houses has been sent to us the Pearl of the Word? I would fain know what is the gift, and who is bearer of the Word, or indeed who is the sender thereof. From heaven thou camest, the form of man thou displayest, and dost radiate forth a blaze (*or torch*) of light.

17. These things in herself the Holy Virgin asked in doubt. But the angel with such words as these solved her

doubts : "The Holy Spirit shall come unto thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee. Wherefore thou shalt conceive and shalt bear a Son, and shalt call His name Jesus, unto the end that He save the race of men from the death of sin."

18. The Virgin spake in turn unto the angel : My mind swims in thy words as in a sea. How shall this be unto me? for I desire not to know an earthly man, because I have devoted myself to the heavenly Bridegroom. I desire to remain a virgin. I wish not to betray the honour of my virginity.

19. Again in such words as these the angel confirmed the holy Virgin : Fear not, Mary. For 'tis not to frighten thee I came, but to dispel all thought of fear. Fear not, Mary ; for thou hast found grace at God's hands. Scan not too narrowly the grace, since it deigns not to give way to the laws of nature. The Holy Spirit shall come unto thee ; wherefore that which is born of thee is holy and Son of God, sharer of the form and sharer of the substance, and sharer of the eternity of the Father ; in whom the Father, having acquired all manifestations, hath the adumbration (? of Himself) face to face,¹ and by means of the light the glory gleameth forth.

20. Great is the mystery. Thou hast learned, O Mary, that which till now was hidden from angels. Thou hast known that which deaf prophets and patriarchs heard not ; and thou hast heard that which the choirs of the God-clad were not ever held worthy to hear. David and Isaiah, and all the prophets foretold in their preaching about the Lord's becoming man. But do thou alone, O Holy Virgin, receive the mystery unknown by them, and learn and be not perplexed as to how this shall be unto thee. For He that fashioned man out of virgin soil, the Selfsame shall even now do as He will for the salvation of His creature.

¹ The Armenian is obscure, but this seems to be the sense.

21. New radiance now of eternal light gleams forth for us in the inspired fitness (*or* harmony) of these words. Now is it meet and fitting for me to wonder after the manner of the Holy Virgin, to whom in seemly wise before all things the angel gave salutation thus: "Be thou glad and rejoice"; because with her are quickened and live all the treasures of grace. Among all nations she alone was both virgin and mother and without knowledge of man, holy in body and soul. Among all nations she alone was made worthy to bring forth God; alone she carried in her Him¹ who carries along all by His word.

22. And not only is it meet to marvel at the beauty of the Holy Mother of God, but also at the excellence of her spirit. Wherefore were addressed to her the words: "The Lord with thee"; and again also, "The Lord from thee." As if this: "He will save him that is in His image as being pitiful." As purse of the Divine mystery the Holy Virgin made herself ready, in which the Pearl of Life was enveloped in flesh and sealed; and she also became the receptacle of supramundane and Divine salvation.

23. Therefore let us also come, O my friends, and discharge our debt according to our ability; and following the voice of the archangel, let us cry aloud: "Be thou glad and rejoice; the Lord with thee." Nor any heavenly bridegroom He, but the very Lord Himself, the Father of purity and the guardian of virginity, and the Lord of holiness, the creator of inviolability, and the giver of freedom, overseer of salvation, and ordainer of true wisdom and bestower thereof—the Lord Himself with thee; for as much as even in thee the Divine grace reposed [and] upon thee, in order to make alive the race of men like a compassionate Lord.

24. Not any more doth Adam fear the crafty serpent;

¹ Or suffered Him who carries. The verb *krem*, like *φέρω*, is here used first in one sense, and then in the other.

because our Lord is come and hath dispersed the host of the enemy. Not any more doth the race of men fear the craftiness and mad deceit of the serpent, because the Lord hath bruised the head of the dragon in the water of baptism. Not any more do I fear to hear the words: Dust thou wast, and unto dust shalt thou be turned. For the Lord in baptism hath washed away the stain of sin. Not any more do I weep, nor ever lament, nor ever reckon it again to wretchedness, when the thorns wound me. For our Lord hath plucked out by the roots the sins which are our thorns,¹ and hath crowned His head withal. Loosed is the first curse in which He said: Thorns and thistles shall earth bring forth to thee, for the thorn is plucked out by the roots, and the thistle withered up; and from the Holy Virgin hath shot up the tree of life and grace. No more doth Eva fear the reproach of the pangs of childbirth; for by the Holy Virgin her transgressions are blotted out and effaced; forasmuch as in her was God born, to the end that He might make alive him whom He made in His image.

25. A bulwark of imperishable life hath the Holy Virgin become unto us, and a fountain of light to those who have faith in Christ; a sunrise of the reasonable light² is she found to be. Be thou glad and rejoice. The Lord with thee and from thee, who in His Godhead and His manhood is perfect, in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead: "Be glad and rejoice, the Lord with thee and from thee"—with His handmaid the Lord of glory; with her that is unspotted, He that halloweth all; with the beautiful, He who is wonderful in beauty above all the sons of men, to the end that He may make alive him whom He made in His image.

26. In the Divine words of the Teacher we believe and

¹ *Lit.*, of our thorns.

² *i.e.* νοητοῦ φωτός.

rejoice; for with roses and lilies and fragrant wreaths Christ, our imperishable Spring, hath come unto us, and hath filled the fair garden of the churches, even the seed-plots of our hearts, from the paradise of God. So then with holy heart let us draw nigh, and find the golden faith gleaming wide and the fruits of immortality smelling sweet therein. For in the desert of Mary the fair-fruited tree hath shot up, that like one holy and pitiful, He may make alive His creature.

27. Holy and wise in all things was the all-blessed Virgin; in all ways peerless among all nations, and unrivalled among women. Not as the first virgin Eva, who being alone in the garden, was in her weak mind led astray by the serpent; and so took his advice and brought death into the world; and because of that hath been all the suffering of saints. But in her alone, in this Holy Virgin Mary, the Stem of Life hath shot up for us. For she alone was spotless in soul and body.

28. With intrepid mind she spake to the angel: Whence is this salutation, and how shall this be unto me? Dost thou desire to learn how the exceeding magnificent power becomes a fellow-sufferer with us of our poverty? How He that hath power over the hosts assumes the image of our baseness; and how He who is God before the ages is about to become a child and be made flesh, He that putteth on light as a garment and giveth life unto His creature. Grant me, said the Holy Virgin, to learn such an impenetrable mystery, and I become the vessel that receives the Divine mystery (*or* thought), being overshadowed by the Holy Spirit, and [I am] to receive the truth of His flesh in my flesh, unto the building by Wisdom of her abode.

29. The Word becometh flesh and dwelleth in us, that is, in the same flesh, which it took from us; and by the spirit of its native self (*or* soul) it spiritualises [itself]. And the unchangeable God accepts the form of a slave, to the end

that He be regarded by the faithful as man ; but that He may be manifested as God to the unfaithful, in order to renew the first-created.

30. The element of flesh doth the Son of God take from the Holy Virgin, for before the ages He is God. He hath deigned to be born, and to be called Son of man, and to become visible, He the invisible ; and for our sake to be poor, who is all riches ; and to suffer as man, He the impassible and deathless. For with (*or in*) the flesh in truth He was united, but He was not changed in spirit. In a mortal body the Invisible One was enveloped, that He might make it also deathless, making it sharer of His deathlessness through His Godhead ; to the end that He might renew him that was fashioned by His holy hands.

31. Glory and light are come into the world, Christ our God. He glorifies and illumines with His ever-streaming light, to whom the voice of the unseen Father bore witness : " Yonder is My Son and Word, who is before the ages."

32. But Mary was fortified by the word of the angel ; but pondered in herself the birth of the Lord, confronted with the disparity of human thought. Now she lifted herself up to the lofty plane of the Divine, now again her mind was occupied with the lowliness of humanity. And thus as in the scale of reflection she balances the one and the other ; even in that moment she becometh truly worthy of the design (*or mind, or ? entrance*) of God. For she (*or He*) that preserved the treasure of her virginity pure and untarnished, she (*or He*) also made the boundaries of her heart inviolate. And the creature is saved which He made in His image.

33. Christ, Son of God, who was born of the Holy Virgin Mary, hath come as grace into the world ; because by means of grace He hath made us alive, He that fashioned all things. Now that Christ is born into the world, doth all creation dance. He giveth in exchange His temptation,

the coin of long-suffering, that He may claim (for us) the mansions of the kingdom. The Holy Virgin was filled with joy because He took from her His flesh, to the end that He might raise again him that was fallen under sin.

34. Evil thoughts are turned from us, when we sing psalms to Thee, O heavenly and holy Father; beholding the great light which Thou hast given to us, Jesus Christ, who was born of the Holy Virgin and wrought by means of His Godhead wonders; but for our sake accepted sufferings by means of His flesh. We then¹ also still being in the flesh will hasten in body and soul to make the Deity propitious to us with angelic hymns, touching with our hands in figurative wise the divine [element] of the dogma (?), and will sow in our minds (*or* in our mysteries) the truth of faith. For the mystery (*or* thought) is inaccessible, invisible, unchangeable, not to be circumscribed, worshipped in its fulness and marvelled at in [our] mind. For even the Holy Virgin herself had marvelled at the manner of the mystery (*or* thought). How could the splendour of light become the offspring of a woman? She embraced in herself the treasure of life, and pondered in her mind the salutation of the archangel; until in the completion (of time) she bore the fruit of salvation, that it might save (*or* make alive) man.

35. Therefore, O ye fair-fruited and comely branches of Christ's teaching, ye shall in this place bring to us the

¹ The entire sentence from "we then" to "truth of faith" is obscure and ungrammatical in the Armenian, and I have only conjectured its meaning. In Latin it would—"Ergo et nos anima et corpore, etiam nunc esse in corpore, divinum illud angelicis hymnis propitium esse nobis solliciti erimus facere, manu tangentes per figuram divinum illud doctrinæ veritatem fidei in cogitationibus nostris seremus."

Of the words rendered *doctrinæ* and *propitium* I am not sure. The word *baremnatso*, which I render *propitium*, is unknown, but should mean "well-remaining." I take it to be a misrendering of *εὐμενής*. The word rendered by *cogitatio* may also mean "mystery" or "sacrament"; and possibly the entire passage refers to the continued existence in the sacrament of the body of Christ.

fruits of blessing (= εὐλογίας). Here, where is all purity and fragrance, let us offer to God with holy conscience the incense of prayer. Here, where virginity and temperance dance together, bearing for fruit the life-giving cluster of grapes. Here, where they . . . unto us the . . . of victorious power and the treasure of love.² Here, where the mystery of the Holy Trinity was revealed by the archangel to the Holy Virgin according to the gospel: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee and the power of the most High shall overshadow thee. For Holy is that which is born of thee, Son of God." To whom be glory and honour for ever and ever.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

¹ The Armenian MS. is mutilated here.

ST. PAUL AND THE JEWISH CHRISTIANS
IN A.D. 46.

DR. SANDAY, in his kind notice of my *St. Paul*,¹ refers to the mention of my two masters, Mommsen and Lightfoot. It has been my misfortune that the right to add a third to that list has been denied me by my distance from himself. I know from some occasional conversations, as well as from the testimony of others, how much I have lost by not having the opportunity of carrying my difficulties to him, to be discussed with his knowledge and sympathy and fairness of judgment. Every one who knows Oxford knows how much he has done for the younger generation of Oxford students; but we who live far from Oxford sometimes feel that he has "to college given up what was meant for mankind," and has given the world in general only the too scanty residue of his time and work.

It is not my desire to take up the position of arguing with him; but the question to which he has devoted most of his paper in the last *EXPOSITOR* is so important and of such wide-reaching consequences that it seems right to add a short statement on the other side. Especially it seems advisable, in respect of his statement, that I have not seen clearly enough the arguments that tell on the side opposed to myself (p. 83), to remind the reader that I was by my plan confined to the statement of my own view, according the minimum of notice to contrary arguments.² I wished to write only a short book. I transgressed my intended

¹ My thanks are due for his courtesy in sending me his proofs early in January, and allowing me to suggest to him some places where in my book I had indicated my attitude. But I did not begin to reply till I had seen his article finally in the bound number of the *Expositor*.

² My case can be estimated only from the whole run of history 40-50 A.D. Many paragraphs in Chapters I. and III.-IX. embody a reply in non-controversial form to the arguments opposed to me.

limits by sixty pages ; but had I given a full consideration of other opinions and the reasons that compelled me to reject them, two large volumes would have been required. Dr. Sanday has evidently considered that, in particular, I have not seen sufficiently the force of the arguments that are advanced in favour of identifying the visit of Paul to Jerusalem described in *Galatians* ii. 1-10 with that described in *Acts* xv. ; and he "states a case on the other side." Perhaps his impression is true ; perhaps I have not realized the strength of the other side ; but at least I was long a believer in it and in the consequences that rise from it (which neither he nor Lightfoot have been willing to accept). His statement of the arguments on this question in the last EXPOSITOR, apart from a few incidental and unessential phrases, might have been written before my book appeared. Though he intends "to weigh the minor arguments for and against," he hardly notices the reasons which are given in my book for my view, and I cannot find that he touches on any of those which seemed to me most telling. The view which he states had been read by me many times, as stated by himself previously, by Lightfoot, and by others, and had been considered by me as carefully as I am capable of considering anything ; and it seems best now to state the reasons that weighed with me in rejecting it.

For my own part I regret for more than one reason that Dr. Sanday has preferred the plan of re-stating the case as it presented itself to him of old. Not merely am I thus deprived of what I should have highly valued, viz., the criticism which he would have had to offer on my arguments after weighing them—and there is no person whose criticism I should have esteemed more highly,—but further, Dr. Sanday seems to me to re-state from memory opinions and reasons which commended themselves to him formerly, when he thought differently on at least one fundamental

and universally transforming fact in early Christian history. When he weighed the whole question and decided it formerly, at the time that he was preparing his edition of *Galatians* (1878), he held unhesitatingly the North-Galatian view. Now while it seems to be not wholly impossible for a "North-Galatian" to think as I do about *Galatians* ii. 1-10,¹ at least he is deprived of most of the arguments that seem to me strongest. On the North-Galatian view Paul had paid the visit of *Acts* xv. before he ever saw Galatia; and he was therefore bound to mention that visit in describing to the Galatians the influences that had affected his mind before he first preached to them. If he omitted that visit from his autobiographical sketch, he would be leaving out the fact that told most strongly against him, and common honesty forbade the omission. Dr. Sanday, naturally, was unwilling to admit a view that was so fatal to Paul's fairness in argument.

Now in regard to the present question, the South-Galatian view seems to me to effect a vital transformation. Whereas the North-Galatian theory makes it an imperative duty for Paul to speak of the third visit (*Acts* xv.) in the opening of his argument to the Galatians, chapters i., ii., the South-Galatian theory, on the contrary, makes it an argumentative absurdity for him to touch on the third visit; on the South-Galatian theory the third visit to Jerusalem was later than the conversion of the Galatians, and it would therefore be not merely unnecessary, but meaningless, to speak of that visit when he was discussing the origin of, and authority for, his original message to the Galatians.

Dr. Sanday has publicly stated his withdrawal from the North-Galatian position. Now I have myself often experienced how necessary it is for an investigator and seeker

¹ I am under the impression that Fritzsche held the "North-Galatian" view; and yet Lightfoot says "the arguments in favour of the second visit of the *Acts* are best stated by Fritzsche, *Opusc.*, pp. 223 ff."

after truth, when he alters his view on any important point in ancient history or geography, to review carefully everything that lies around it. He must strip off from himself all his opinions on the entire subject, reconsider every point from first principles, and rebuild his whole view from the foundations. Some opinions will emerge from the process practically unchanged, but others may be found to have been materially affected by the change in the point of view. Unless one does this, it seems to me impossible to feel any confidence that one is not allowing opinions to retain their seat, which were connected with and coloured by one's former view on the point about which one has now come to think differently. The impression is conveyed to me by this article, I must confess, that Dr. Sanday has not yet gone through this process in the history of 40-50 A.D.; and considering the onerous duties and engagements that keep incessantly pressing on his time, this is not strange.

In his edition of *Galatians*, p. 466, he explained Paul's failure to allude to the Decree by supposing (as Lightfoot also did) that the Decree was not applicable to the Galatians. He says, "It would not follow that the Decree would be binding on other Gentile Churches." But Paul had actually delivered it to the South-Galatian Churches (*Acts* xvi. 4); and he therefore did consider it binding on them. But, on any theory, it is a position that seems untenable, without a larger share of theological acuteness than I possess, to maintain that its enactments were special, and that it was not "intended to be permanent and universal," or, as Dr. Sanday puts it, that it must not be taken as binding on other Gentile Churches than those to whom it was addressed. He says that it applied only to "a particular district which was in comparatively close communion with Judæa," viz., Syria and Cilicia. But Luke declares in sweeping terms that Paul, on his

second journey, "delivered them the Decrees for to keep." No one can say that Lystra or Iconium were "in comparatively close communion with Judæa." On the contrary, that long land-journey severed them; and the Jews of central Asia Minor were notoriously isolated and weak in Judaism (*St. Paul*, p. 142).

Dr. Sanday "puts in the forefront the one consideration which compels him to adhere to the older view." He believes that *Galatians* ii. 1-10 describes a state of things more advanced than we find in *Acts* xi. 30 (p. 85); and he says that, at the time described in *Acts* xi. 30, "there is no watchword 'Jew' and 'Gentile,' no antithesis of 'circumcision' and 'uncircumcision.'"¹ Those watchwords and that antithesis seem to him to describe, on the other hand, exactly the situation of affairs indicated in *Acts* xv. This consideration "seems to him in the strictly Baconian sense crucial."

Such is Dr. Sanday's theory. How does it agree with the facts as recorded by Luke, the only authority that it recognises for A.D. 44-46?

Two reasons seem to me to tell against this theory, and to show that "the antithesis of 'circumcision' and 'uncircumcision'" was completely developed at the stage described in *Acts* xi. 30: (1) the words of Luke himself (*Acts* xi. 2) show the antithesis in full operation at an earlier stage, probably several years before the visit alluded to in xi. 30, xii. 25; (2) human nature, and especially Jewish nature, make it plain that the antithesis would start into full life the moment that an uncircumcised Gentile was introduced into the Church.

It seems to me so natural that the strong prejudice and antipathy of the Jews should be roused when the first news

¹ Dr. Sanday (p. 86) claims me as his supporter in dating the origin of this antithesis so late. But in my *St. Paul*, p. 58, I speak of "two distinct and opposed opinions" in A.D. 45; and on the same page I use the term "party."

about Cornelius reached Jerusalem, that it would constitute a strong argument (in my humble judgment) against the credibility of Luke's history, if he confirmed Dr. Sanday's belief that the antithesis was not developed until the Apostolic Council, fully ten or twelve years after this uncircumcised Gentile was admitted into the Church. Throughout all history a word, or a report, of violation of the deep convictions and pride of religion of the Jews has been sufficient to rouse them: had it not been for the intense strength and fire of their convictions, the race could never have maintained its character as it has done. Luke confirms all the impression that we gather from later history. He tells that on Cornelius's baptism "the brethren that were in Judæa heard that the Gentiles also had received the word of God; and when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, 'Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised and didst eat with them.'" That is exactly "the same stage in the controversy as to the admission of Gentile converts which had been reached by the date of" *Galatians* ii. 11-14.¹ Luke pointedly brings out the complete identity of feeling and conflict by using the same terms that Paul employs (*μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν* and *τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς*, compare *συνέφαγεν αὐτοῖς* and *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς*); and in particular the use of the term *τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς* implies that the presence or absence of the sign *περιτομή* was already the mark and badge of distinction between two parties.

The consideration that Dr. Sanday "puts in the forefront" of his case, therefore, seems to me to contradict the clear evidence of Luke. The stage of *Galatians* ii. was already reached in *Acts* xi.; and Luke marks the identity by using the same terms. But in xv. he uses terms that go more into the details of the party constitution: he speaks no longer in general of *τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς*, but of *τινες τῶν*

¹ We are agreed that *vv.* 11-14 refer to a later period than *vv.* 1-10.

ἀπὸ τῆς αἰρέσεως τῶν Φαρισαίων (xv. 5). Dr. Sanday points out (p. 91) that, in contrast with Luke, Paul in *Galatians* ii. "writes from within, from the innermost of inner circles, of things perhaps in part known only to himself and God." Yes! and Luke applies the words of Paul in this passage to describe the state of things in xi., and uses different terms to describe the state of things in xv. 5. Even in such a slight matter of terms and words, we find that Luke's language is marked by the same accuracy as usual—that here, as elsewhere, his narrative seems to be the form in which the spirit of history naturally framed itself.

It is true that Dr. Sanday does not share in my high opinion of Luke as a historian. There, I think, lies the one advantage which I have over him in this case; but it is a great advantage. In a most obscure subject I have been led on to seize the only clue, to follow it unwaveringly, and to find how plain the seeming maze becomes, when one accepts the proffered guidance of Luke, and disregards theories framed on a low estimate of his knowledge and his skill as a historian. To test my theory of Luke's historical insight and power, the critic must assume it to be true and work out the history accordingly. But Dr. Sanday had made up his mind many years ago against Luke, and is therefore able to decide forthwith against me.

It is at this point worth while to notice how Luke conceives and expresses the further development between the situation of *Galatians* ii. 11–14, and the situation of *Acts* xv. In *Galatians* and in *Acts* xi. the one side consists of οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς: what is the extent of that party? The interpretation of Lightfoot, and Meyer-Wendt, and of Dr. Sanday himself (shared apparently by Blass also), seems to be obviously right: the whole body of the Jewish Christians are summed up as οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς. In those two chapters, then,

we are presented with a situation in which there stand on one side that body¹ as a whole, on the other side the uncircumcised Christians. That is precisely Dr. Sanday's definition of the two parties, which he considers to have not come into existence in *Acts* xi., but to be in existence in *Acts* xv. But what does Luke say of the parties in *Acts* xv.? If we put out of sight the three first verses, in which the scene is in Antioch, and take only verses 5 ff., which Dr. Sanday takes to correspond to *Galatians* ii. 1-10, we see that the party opposed to the Gentile Christians is now no longer the Jewish Christians as a body: a certain number of Jewish Christians have ranged themselves alongside of the uncircumcised, including Peter and Barnabas, and probably other envoys from Antioch: it is therefore no longer correct to speak of τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς as one of the two parties, and Luke is careful to use a more restricted term.

Again, it is a necessary part of the view against which I am pleading (and on this point Dr. Sanday, p. 93, is fully agreed) that the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem, mentioned in *Acts* xi. 30, was paid in the early months of A.D. 44, and that the persecution described in xii. proceeded during and after the visit,² so that "the leading apostles were in some sort of hiding." The two envoys took up the money and delivered it to the presbyters; and "the Judæan Church was left to lay in stores for itself" (p. 93, note). Thus Paul did not see any of the apostles on this visit.

That view has been stated long ago in very clear and at first sight persuasive terms by Lightfoot and by Dr Sanday himself. The following-reasons (in addition to some stated in my book, which would be too long to repeat) seem to

¹ Paul, as the narrator, is excluded in *Galatians* ii. 12; and, as not present in Jerusalem, he is excluded in *Acts* xi. 2.

² In no other way than by the supposed absence of the apostles can the failure of Paul to mention this visit be explained (to me the explanation seems quite inadequate); and their absence can be accounted for only by the persecution in the early months of 44.

me to prove that the account of Luke is inconsistent with it.

(1) Barnabas and Saul were sent to Jerusalem in charge of the money. The purpose for which the money was intended—ministration to the inhabitants of Jerusalem (*διακονίαν, κτλ.*)—is defined in xi. 29. They completed the ministration (*πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν*), and returned to Antioch, xii. 25. Here Luke lays decided stress on the ministration: he first describes the general instructions given to the envoys, and afterwards emphatically says that they completely carried out the ministration. I might here institute a detailed comparison of the passages where *διακονία* occurs, in order to bring out that it implies much more than the mere handing over of a sum of money; but I need not take up space therewith, for probably the point will not be disputed. Luke's usage is too clear. In *Luke* x. 40, *Acts* vi. 1, the regular practice of personal service and personal work for the help and comfort of others is plainly demanded. By its form the word necessarily implies not a single action, but a customary process, and *τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου*, vi. 4 (compare i. 17, 25, xx. 24, xxi. 19), transfers the idea of continued personal service and personal ministration to another department. If Luke in xi. 29, xii. 25 applied the term *διακονία* to the mere handing over of a sum of money by two officials to a body of officials, he showed himself dull to the meaning of the word; but there is not throughout the whole of his two books any word or clause that does not seem to me to imply great delicacy in his sense for, and employment of, words.

I do not insist here on what is urged at length in my book, viz., that the value and efficacy of the action of the Antiochians lay mainly in the daily, weekly, and monthly ministration to the starving poor in Jerusalem. It was this that brought home to the Christians in Jerusalem the kindness and brotherhood of their fellow-

Christians in Antioch; it was this that unified the Church by the work of charity.

But it appears worth while insisting for a moment on a point omitted in my book. The instructions given by the Antiochian Church to Barnabas and Saul did not absolutely require that the two envoys should personally make the distribution. Their orders would not have been disobeyed, if the envoys had entrusted the money to the presbyters for distribution. Now I have pointed out how, time after time, Luke contents himself with stating that instructions were given or plans formed, and then leaves the reader by his silence to understand that the instructions were carried out and the plans executed (*St. Paul*, pp. 181, 233, 295, 342). In this case, however, Luke pointedly records that the distribution was carried out to its completion by Barnabas and Saul in person (xii. 25).

(2) As the embassy was one of a purely business kind, it was addressed only to the presbyters, for it was not fit that the apostles should serve tables (Acts vi. 2; *St. Paul*, p. 52). This shows that the silence about the apostles in xi. 30 gives no warrant for inferring that they were absent from Jerusalem. On the view stated by Dr. Sanday it would be necessary to suppose that, first of all, the apostles fled; next, news reached the distant Antioch that they had fled, and that there were only presbyters left in Jerusalem to receive the money; and, finally, the Antiochian Church was in such a hurry to send up the money provided against a famine which was still hid in the mists of the future, and known only from a prophecy,¹ that they despatched their two envoys in the midst of the persecution to deliver the money to the presbyters. Dr. Sanday tries to guard

¹ It will not, I imagine, be disputed by any one who reads Josephus's account that the earliest beginning of the famine consistent with his words is 45 (*i.e.* failure of the harvest in that year). Lightfoot is quite clear in recognising that in his *Biblical Essays*.

against this *reductio ad absurdum* (which I had privately mentioned to him) by the statement that xi. 30 is "a compendious expression"; and he infers from it that the money was intended to be delivered to the apostles and elders, but owing to the flight of the apostles it had to be delivered to the elders alone. I have sometimes taken a good deal of meaning from a few words of Luke, but I have never ventured to take anything like this tortuous interpretation from the simple and plain words "sending it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul"; and I still cling to the belief that Luke meant what he says, and that when they sent it to the elders, they sent it to the elders and not to the apostles.

(3) Luke shows plainly his opinion that "the apostles" remained in Jerusalem during the persecution of Herod. It is evident from his early chapters taken as a whole that he conceived that "the guidance of affairs rested with" them (*St. Paul*, pp. 53, 374, 381), and that Jerusalem was their regular station; and he speaks in such places as ix. 28 of "the apostles" merely as the permanent supreme governing body, without any implication that the whole body was in the city at that moment. He was perfectly aware that some or even many of them were often absent¹ (*Gal.* i. 18), but he speaks of those who remained in the city as "the apostles," in the sense of "the supreme authority." Naturally he had no detailed statistics to enable him to say how many apostles were actually present at any moment in Jerusalem; but he clearly considered that "the apostles" were always there. By him the Church in Jerusalem without "the apostles" was not thought of.

Moreover, in xii. 17, he plainly implies that the Church in Jerusalem was in its ordinary condition with James present as its resident head. In my *St. Paul*, p. 63, I have

¹ He doubtless understood that mission work of various kinds and in various quarters was performed by them.

been content to mention this in a line, for xii. 17 appeared to me so clear as to need only a passing reference. But on re-reading Dr. Sanday's *Galatians*, p. 465, I observe he draws the directly opposite inference from that verse. He says, "James, the Lord's brother, was in hiding (*Acts* xii. 17)." Let us consider the situation; and I think we shall have to conclude that in this case the principle of treating Luke as a rough narrator, who has to be squeezed into conformity with Paul (or rather with a theory of Paul's meaning), has led Dr. Sanday astray. His conception of the meeting in Mary's house is that it was an assembly of the Church: he speaks of "the Church assembled at the house of Mary"; and, as James was not present in the house, he infers that James had gone into hiding. But Luke plainly intimates that it was not "the Church" which had assembled at the house of Mary; he merely says that "there were a considerable number of persons assembled there, and engaged in prayer" (xii. 12).¹ His language is very different when he describes a formal meeting of the Church or of the brethren: here he implies that a number of persons had voluntarily gathered. Then Peter told the assembled persons to "go and tell James and the brethren"; obviously this phrase sums up "the Church in Jerusalem with its head." Why we should infer from it that "James was in hiding," is hard to understand. Shall we infer also that the brethren as a whole were in hiding? and, if not, why distinguish between James and them? Meyer concluded from v. 17 that the Twelve were absent from Jerusalem, and only James and the brethren remained; but Wendt rightly points out that this conclusion is unjustifiable: the phrase used simply in-

¹ οὗ ἦσαν ἱκανοὶ συνηθροισμένοι καὶ προσευχόμενοι: ἀθροίξεν implies a meeting for private or accidental reasons, xix. 25: "to hold a meeting of the Church" is expressed by συνάγειν, iv. 31, xi. 26, xiv. 27, xv. 30, xx. 7, 8; συνάγειν implies a formal meeting of some other body in iv. 5, xv. 6.

dicates the whole body of the Church in Jerusalem. Peter was going into hiding, and he said, "Tell the Church the marvellous news of my release and departure." So far as I can judge, the implication is plain, that James was understood by Peter to be then in Jerusalem; and the authority to whom Luke was indebted (obviously John Mark, v. 12, as Blass says) would probably not have left the point unnoted, if Peter's impression had been wrong.

I have ventured to speak in rather strong terms of this unworthy idea that the apostles all fled, and left the presbyters to endure the storm (*St. Paul*, p. 53); on consideration, I cannot withdraw anything of what is there said; I follow Luke and follow honour. James, as Luke states, stood at his post (and one naturally infers that others stood at theirs, some in Jerusalem, and some on work outside the city). There is nothing said in xii. to show that the persecution was a very sharp one; and it was certainly very short. The language of xii. 1 and 19 implies nothing like the "great persecution" that ensued on Stephen's death; yet in that terrible time the apostles had stood firm, for "they were all scattered abroad except the apostles" (viii. 1). The plain implication of Luke is that the apostles in xii. did as they were wont to do; and nothing except a theory could lead to any other belief.

In all my work on this period of history, it has been a chief object to bring out that the early Christians were endowed with a fair amount of practical sense, nay, even that the foundations of the organized Church were laid by men of great, in some cases of consummate, practical ability. It is therefore hard for me to believe that the Antiochian Church raised a sum against a future famine, and sent the money up when they had no means of knowing at what time the famine was likely to occur. The cause of famine lies in difficulty of communication, and the consequent difficulty of fetching in food from outside

to the country where the crops have failed. It was therefore a bad method to send money to Jerusalem as provision against a future famine. When the famine occurred, it would be doubly difficult for the elders in Jerusalem to send away the money and get the food. All they could then do would be to buy in Jerusalem at famine prices, whereas, if they in Antioch waited till the famine occurred, they could buy in the cheaper market, send in supplies, and distribute them to the people. Looked at from any point, Dr. Sanday's view reveals to us conduct so strange as to excite reasonable suspicion of the whole story. At least my view makes it sensible, rational, prudent, and effective.

In one respect Dr. Sanday, in this recent article, goes beyond his former utterance, carrying out more fully a suggestion that he made briefly there (*Galatians*, p. 464). He now assumes unhesitatingly on pp. 90 f. that Luke in Acts xv. was dependent entirely on information given by one of the crowd, who had access only to the most superficial facts; and he thus explains away the want of harmony between the accounts of Paul and Luke. But surely it is impossible to suppose that Luke was ignorant of Paul's view on this all-important subject. During the long years of intercourse between them, how can we believe that they never talked of the Apostolic Council? They met when Paul was fresh from the Council, and was everywhere "delivering them the decrees for to keep, which had been ordained of the apostles and elders that were at Jerusalem" (*Acts* xvi. 4). Why should we think that Paul never related the circumstances to Luke? Is it not more natural to suppose that they had often talked over the events of the Council, and that Luke was familiar with Paul's view? Dr. Sanday seems to maintain that Paul's view was unknown to Luke, or had been forgotten by him, or was considered by him less trustworthy than

that of his "informant." In any of these cases, I think the burden of proof lies on Dr. Sanday, and that natural probability is for me.

Like all who take that view, Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Sanday emphasize the "striking coincidence of circumstances," or "undesigned coincidences," between *Acts* xv. and *Galatians* ii. 1-10. These agreements, however, are inseparable from any stage of the dispute, and do not therefore prove identity. For example, Lightfoot emphasizes the fact that in both "Paul and Barnabas appear as the representatives of the Gentile Churches, Cephas and James as the leaders of the circumcision." But who else could at any time appear in these positions?

One "agreement" even is quoted on their side, which, properly interpreted, tells against them. In *Galatians* ii. 1 Paul took with him Titus *as a subordinate*¹ on his own responsibility and choice.² In *Acts* xv. 2 the Church in Antioch sent certain other delegates in addition to Paul and Barnabas; these are members of a delegation, on a footing of equality with Paul; and yet it is assumed that Titus, the subordinate helper chosen by Paul in *Galatians* ii. 1, is one of the co-ordinate delegates sent by the Church in *Acts* xv. 2, and this is called a coincidence.

It would be right to indicate some of the reasons which show that the second visit mentioned by Paul is the second visit mentioned by Luke. I pass over the fact already alluded to, that on the South-Galatian theory Paul could not speak of the third visit, because his purpose in his argument to the Galatians confines him to the period before he entered Galatia, *i.e.* before *Acts* xiii. 14. The consideration which I should place in the forefront is that Paul

¹ The term occurs several times, always with a distinct implication. See my *St. Paul*, pp. 59, 71, 170, 177.

² More strictly, I believe that Paul and Barnabas both are implied as choosing their assistant: but grammatically the form, "I, with Barnabas," involves that the verbs following are singular.

could not honestly say that the visit described in *Acts* xv. told in favour of his argument, yet he boldly appeals to the visit which he is describing, *Galatians* ii. 1-10, as conclusive in favour of his argument; he speaks as if it were sufficient to direct the attention of his readers to the facts of that visit in order that they should recognise that they proved his case. But they who maintain that he is here describing the third visit (passing over the second unnoticed) actually hold that he omits from his description all allusion to the public action which formed the one reason and purpose of the visit, and which tells so strongly against his argument. In fact they accuse Paul of suppressing all the facts that tell against him—they charge him with flagrant dishonesty in argument. This is not a case where one is free to gloss over ugly acts by delicate words. When I began to study this subject more than twenty years ago, and accepted Lightfoot's view, my sense of common honesty revolted against this passage in the Epistle and against its author, and the effect on my mind was strong and lasting. These theorists make his argument a deception and a fraud, if Luke's account is trustworthy. Naturally, therefore, they proceed to discount Luke's general accuracy: they save Paul at the expense of Luke: that is a plain and straightforward way of describing the situation.

Neither Bishop Lightfoot nor Dr. Sanday really face this difficulty. Apparently they hardly realize its force; and yet, to my commonplace, non-theological mind, it is the one great fact. Let any one, who wants to estimate the case, try to put away all previous conceptions, read over *Acts* xv., and frame from this (almost the fullest and most detailed narrative of a public question on all its sides that *Acts* contains) a conception of the council as Luke conceived it. Then let him judge whether Paul could fairly quote that council as a proof that he had received no part of his message except from the revelation of Jesus Christ. If he

thinks that Paul could quote this proof confidently on his own side, then we must agree to differ; we have reached a fundamental opposition with regard to the meaning of words; but I think that we may be able to differ on the point without abating our mutual friendship, and I shall certainly not abate my admiration for Dr. Sanday.

The strength of the Tübingen position lay in this question: the answer made by Lightfoot to the "critical" argument always seemed to me singularly unsatisfying: at the best it could only be considered "the lesser of two evils." My view furnishes a complete reply, while fully acknowledging the logical skill of the "critics."

W. M. RAMSAY.

“AN ELECT RACE.”

(1 PETER II. 9.)

THESE words complete that account of the ideal sanctity and blessedness of all that are in Christ which is contained in the fourth and fifth verses of the chapter. Before attempting to develop their meaning, it may be well to say something about the quotation from the Old Testament which occurs in the intervening verses.

Peter has described Christ as “a living stone” on which, “as living stones,” all Christian men “are built up—a spiritual house.” The metaphor was probably suggested by a memorable passage in the 16th verse of the 28th chapter of the prophecies of Isaiah. He quotes it with some freedom, as far as the form is concerned; partly as it appears in the Hebrew, partly as it appears in the Septuagint version.

“Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious : and he that believeth on him (or it) shall not be put to shame.”

The prophecy was delivered at a time when the Jewish nation was in peril of an Assyrian invasion; the rulers were arranging for a treaty with Egypt; their policy is denounced by the prophet in the fiercest and most menacing terms, and they are told that their strength and safety were not to be found in alliances with any heathen powers. The true rock on which they were to build was in Zion itself; they were to trust in God’s eternal fidelity to the race which He had chosen: this was the precious corner stone and the solid foundation on which they were to construct all their national policy; and if their faith rested on this, they would not be put to shame. *Christ*, according to Peter, is the foundation on which the human race is now to build. He is the true foundation, the true corner stone, elect, precious or honoured. And those who build on Him share the preciousness or honour.

As for those who refuse to believe, he reminds them that "*The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner,*"—a quotation from the 118th Psalm with which I have already dealt.

And that quotation suggests another from the early part of Isaiah (viii. 14). God would be a sacred stone like that at Bethel—a sanctuary for those who trusted in Him and honoured Him; but for those who refused to trust He would be "*a rock of offence,*"—a stone over which they should stumble as they fled from their enemies; and, stumbling, their limbs would be broken.

The language is the language of the imagination, and of the imagination under strong excitement. But its meaning is not obscure. To those who trust in God He will give safety and peace, but those who refuse to trust in Him He will sharply punish. How men bear themselves to Him is the critical question: in Him, if they are loyal, they are to find safety; in Him, if they are disloyal, they are to find trouble, and sorrow, and punishment. It is what the moralist says in another form. Those great moral laws which are supreme over human conduct give safety, and peace, and honour to men and nations that obey them, and inflict shame and ruin on men and nations that defy them. They are a sanctuary to good men; they are "*a rock of offence and a stone of stumbling*" to bad men. And to that stumbling they are "*appointed*"; if they are disobedient, they are destined to come to harm. Peter does not mean that they are destined to disobedience, but that being disobedient they are destined to stumble. A very natural misconception of his thought has arisen from the unusual meaning of the word "*stumble*" in this passage. Elsewhere, to "*stumble*" usually means to commit sin, to fall under temptation, but here the meaning is quite different; it means to come to harm through committing sin. Peter is speaking of the disobedient; they are running recklessly

in the wrong way, and they stumble over the great stone, and by stumbling their limbs are broken. That is what they are destined to. God means those to suffer who disobey Him. Their suffering is not accidental, it is of Divine appointment.

And now we come to the noble words with which this movement of thought closes. It completes the illustration showing how the ancient Judaism had been transfigured to the mind of the apostle. He had been born a Jew, but had become a Christian, and yet he had not broken with his past. How could he? The memories, the hopes, the institutions of Judaism had been wrought into the very substance of his religious life. He had not lost any of them; they were glorified. It had been his joy and pride to belong to a "race elect" of God; now all Christian men are the true, elect race. The election of the Jewish people was the symbol of an election far more sacred and glorious. In a very true sense the Jewish people had been a "priesthood"; they had been destined to this sanctity. But Christian men are the true priesthood,—the royal priesthood,—because consecrated to the service of the Divine King. And Christian men are the "holy nation"—citizens of the true kingdom of God. Israel had once been God's "*peculiar possession*," He had separated it from all other countries and peoples to be in a wonderful sense His own, but now this blessedness and honour belong to all Christians. The phrase "*peculiar possession*" is a curious and suggestive one. It is not quite easy to give its full force in English. But let me illustrate it. In each of the Australian colonies there are extensive grounds surrounding the house in which the Governor lives. These are called the "domain"; the Governor has authority over the whole country, but the "domain" is his "*peculiar possession*." An ingenious commentator has given one or two other illustrations of what the words mean: the money a slave

had earned by working over hours, or the money a wife may have apart from her husband,—this might be described as their "*peculiar possession*." Or to use a still more familiar illustration, the word means exactly what children mean when they speak of something as being their *very own*. The whole world belongs to God; Christian men belong to Him in a very special and exceptional sense.

And their blessedness and honour are not for themselves alone: they are elect of God, they are a royal priesthood, they are a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, that they "*may shew forth the excellence of Him that called them out of darkness into His marvellous light*." That, too, is a reminiscence of another passage in Isaiah (xliii. 21), in which the Jewish nation is described as "The people which I formed for Myself, that they might set forth My praise." The privileges bestowed on the Jewish race were not for themselves merely, but for all mankind. They were to bear witness to all nations concerning the greatness, the righteousness, the mercy of God. Hence in the 105th Psalm (vv. 14, 15), in which the great deeds of God for the Jewish people are celebrated, it is said that "He reproved kings for their sakes; saying, Touch not mine anointed ones, and do My prophets no harm." All the people were consecrated to God: all had to deliver their testimony to the glory of the Eternal.

The great place which was appointed to the Jewish nation in the order of the world, and the great purpose which it failed to fulfil, belong now to Christian people scattered over all countries, who in the natural order did not constitute a people, but who are now through God's great mercy drawn into one great community consecrated to His service and glory.

It is to this conception of the Church that I wish to call attention. The blessings of the Christian redemption are *ours*, and through Christ we have come into the light of

God. The heavy darkness which concealed God from us has passed away. We know Him for ourselves. We know that He has forgiven us, that we have received eternal life, that we dwell in God and God in us.

But there is a noble and generous element in the ideal life of the Church, which we cannot ignore without defeating one of the great ends for which the redemption came to us. The whole Church is to tell out—to proclaim—the excellencies of God. Peter is not thinking so much of the worship we have to offer to God as of the testimony which we have to deliver to men,—and to deliver in order that men may be brought into the same light as ourselves. He is thinking of that conception of the Jewish nation which is contained in the verses of the Psalm, which I have already quoted.

All were prophets. Every Jew, layman or priest, that was in Egypt when the plagues descended on the Egyptians, could speak of the great deeds of God by which the spirit of their oppressors was broken, and the way prepared for their emancipation. Every Jew, layman or priest, that crossed the dry bed of the Red Sea, and so escaped from the armies of Pharaoh, could speak of the strong wind of God which beat back the waters, and gave the nation of fugitives a dry path to the desert. And the wonderful deliverances which in later times were achieved for the Jewish race—it needed no genius, no exceptional sanctity, no official authority to speak of them; the whole nation witnessed them, shared in them, and could speak of them: it was a nation of prophets.

We too—all Christian men—as we are a race of priests, are also a race of prophets, and we have to speak to men of greater deliverances which reveal "*excellencies*" of God more wonderful and glorious than those which were revealed in the national deliverances of the Jewish people. We have to declare to men that we have been "*called out*

of darkness into God's marvellous light." And by this is meant not merely that our conduct and character should bear a silent testimony to our redemption; Peter speaks later on of the "*good works*" which are to confirm the testimony. Here he is speaking of the testimony itself: we are a race of prophets, and have to speak for God. And we have to speak of our great transition out of darkness into the marvellous light of God.

It is the manner of New Testament writers to speak of light as the element in which God dwells and in which He reveals His power, His righteousness and His love; and our present salvation, though incomplete, is a passing out of darkness into light.

We have found God, because God has found us. He has a real and effective place in our life. We may not obey Him perfectly, but His will is the law of our conduct; and though we may be turned aside into inferior paths, the main direction of our effort is towards pleasing Him. His love, even where it does not create a joy which is never clouded, is a solace, a support; it sometimes fills the heart with the light of heaven; it is a constraining and an animating force. We know that He has forgiven our sins. We know that we have received strength from Him for righteous living, and that, although we may come far short of perfection, we are different men from what we should have been but for the Christian redemption. Life is less lonely to us because God is near; it is less terrible, less menacing, because we know that He is supreme. Without Him, the world would now be very dark to us, although as yet we do not see His great glory. He is on our side; we are on His side. Our remembrance of His presence, our trust in His righteousness and love give us courage, and hope, and endurance, as well as guidance. Many of us are conscious that we are really His children,—that we share His life as well as His love. To some the light may have

come with all the suddenness of a tropical sunrise; to others, so gradually that they could hardly tell when the night ended and the first rays of dawn shot across the eastern sky. But if we try to imagine what life and the world and the universe would be to us if all that we know of God and have experienced of His grace were suddenly to disappear, we discover that we are really living a life to which God has become necessary, and which would lose its dignity, and peace, and power, and hope if God were lost.

We have been called into God's "*marvellous light*": both the call and the answer illustrate His excellencies,—His infinite abhorrence of the evil life from which He has delivered us,—His infinite love of the righteous life to which He has called us,—His love for us and His mercy,—His power to change the direction of the main currents of life; to give energy to our desire to keep the law, to add depth and fervour to our love for Himself. We are amazed that He should have loved us; for apart from Himself there is nothing in us to love. We are amazed that He should be able to make righteousness possible to us; for in ourselves there seems an unmeasured and invincible tendency to sin. We are amazed that even here we should have access to Him. How wonderful it is that creatures with powers so limited—powers too, which, apart from His inspiration, are never earnestly and persistently put forth either in the endeavour to do His will, or in the endeavour to find Him—how wonderful it is, with the sin that is in us as well as the infirmity, that we should receive the very life of God, and should know that He is indeed and of a truth our Father! We bear testimony to the excellencies of Him who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light.

As really as the ancient prophets were destined to tell men of the great discoveries of the thought and will of God which they had received by the Spirit, we are destined to tell men of our own great transition from darkness into

marvellous light through God's infinite love and power. We cannot bear testimony at first hand to miracles wrought by Christ during His earthly life. But we can bear testimony at first hand to miracles still more wonderful, and with a larger meaning,—can make our own the memorable words, "Whereas I was blind, now I see." We are not original witnesses of Christ's resurrection, but we can tell men of our own. We have passed out of darkness and death into the light and life of God.

Do you say, It is hard to be sure of it? Let me ask you whether you have tried to be sure; whether you have taken pains to be sure; whether you have made it a great and serious object to be sure?

There are several causes which, under God, account for the immense success of the great Wesleyan movement of the last century: one of them is the earnestness with which John Wesley and the early Methodist preachers insisted on the duty of obtaining what they called *assurance*. I am not quite clear that they were always right in their terminology; but I am quite clear that they were right in the substance of their meaning. A Christian man ought to have as certain a knowledge that he has come out of darkness into the light of God as Lazarus had that he had come back out of the grave into the streets of Bethany, and was sitting once more in the house of Mary and Martha. And until we have this knowledge—which the Methodists called "*assurance*"—we cannot show forth His praise.

Can we have it? Can we all have it? I see no reason why we may not all have it. The immense majority, I imagine, of the Methodist converts in the last century had it; they had it because they wanted it, believed that it was possible, prayed for it earnestly and persistently, prayed for it till they had it.

And so there was a great army of men eager to preach.

Many of them knew very little, but they knew the great thing which it is necessary for a witness to know. They knew their facts, and were hot and eager to bear testimony to them. And it was not the preachers alone who bore the testimony; every man, every woman that had found God, and was sure of it, was also hot and eager to bear testimony. Brother spoke to brother, sister to sister, friend to friend, and the fire spread, and soon a great part of England and then of Wales and Scotland and America was aflame. It was an age in which the fortunes of the Christian faith seemed lost. Cool, speculative, learned men thought that they had wholly discredited the testimony of the four Evangelists to the power and glory of Christ; but instead of the four, here were hundreds of fresh witnesses, original witnesses; and the hundreds grew to thousands, and the thousands to tens of thousands, and faith, which seemed beaten to the ground, rose exulting, and won most splendid victories.

Shall we not ask God to give to all of us this sure assurance of our redemption? Shall we not seek it for others as well as for ourselves?

This is the Divine method of creating faith: not by the examination of ancient records, but by the utterance of living men who know for themselves.

And if we know, God deliver us from the shame and guilt of refusing to bear our testimony.

R. W. DALE.

JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

III. THE IDEALISED PICTURE OF LUKE.

LUKE is the only one of the synoptical Evangelists who takes his readers into his confidence as to the aim and plan which guided him in writing his Gospel. From the statement which he makes in the opening sentence of his work, the following inferences may be drawn :

1. That he lived late in the day, after many attempts had already been made to give an account more or less complete of the public ministry of Jesus.

2. That he had not himself been an eye-witness of any part of that ministry, or even had an opportunity of hearing particulars concerning it from any of the men who "had been with Jesus."

3. That his sources of information were mainly books, written accounts, memoirs of the life of Jesus.

4. That in writing his Gospel he earnestly endeavoured to make a careful, judicious use of these sources.

5. That his aim in writing was to confirm faith in the evangelic tradition in the mind of the friend whose benefit he had chiefly in view: in his own words, "that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed."

Luke, we see, had the spirit of research, and desired to base his narrative on the sure ground of historic fact.

It is quite compatible with this that the Evangelist should be to a certain extent controlled in the construction of his story by his own religious feelings, or by the religious feelings of the time in which he lived, or by the spiritual state of his first readers, whether we include in that category merely the one person named, Theophilus, or a circle in which he was the prominent figure. He might have to

consider what they were likely to be interested in, what they could understand, what they could bear, and his own tastes and sympathies might be very much like theirs.

Compared with the first two Gospels, the third presents characteristics which answer to this hypothetical state of matters. A large number of particulars can be collected from its pages which, taken together, convey the impression of a story told under the influence of certain preconceived ideas or predilections. They are too many to be accidental, and too marked to be the result of the unconscious action of the stream of tradition rolling evangelic incidents down its course, and polishing them into smoothness as it carried them along. One cannot help feeling that there must have been intention at work, at some point, either in our Evangelist, or in those who prepared the sources from which he drew his information.

The features of the narrative which most plainly bear traces of editorial discretion with a view to edification relate to the person and character of our Lord and also of His apostles. The writer seems never to forget the present position of those of whom he has occasion to speak, as the Risen Lord of the Church, and its earthly Heads. The frequent use of the title "Lord" and "apostles" where the other two Evangelists say "Jesus," and "disciples" at once exemplifies and symbolises the reverential attitude. To that attitude it is probably further due that some things related in Matthew and Mark are omitted, some things strongly emphasised, some things set in a subdued light, and, finally, some things introduced for the first time into the evangelic story: all making for one end, giving prominence to certain aspects of the Saviour's career and character that strongly appeal to faith and love, and throwing into the shade others making severer demands on the power of appreciation. In the sections of the narrative relating to the disciples the apparent tendency is to gentle handling

of their weaknesses, while letting it be seen that the weaknesses were there.

It is in view of such characteristics as those above referred to that I apply the epithet "idealised" to the picture of Jesus presented in the Third Gospel. The term needs to be guarded against possible misapprehension. It might suggest the idea of a narrative dominated by a theological idea, or by a controversial tendency, say a keen interest in a universal Gentile, Pauline Christianity. Such a bias has indeed been ascribed to Luke, but dispassionate investigation finds little trace of it. The Evangelist is doubtless Pauline and universalist in his attitude, and it gives him pleasure to record words and acts of Jesus going to prove that He had the Gentiles in view as ultimate participants in the blessings of His gospel. But his interest in such elements of the evangelic tradition is religious, not controversial, and even as such it is by no means keen, absorbing, predominant. If he had been a controversial Paulinist, as imagined by the famous Tübingen school, he would have taken pains to let the twelve appear in as unfavourable a light as possible, whereas the fact is he "ever spares" them. If he had been a keen universalist, he would have reported certain words of our Lord pointing in that direction, given both in Matthew and in Mark, which he nevertheless omits.¹ When therefore the picture of Jesus given by Luke is described as "idealised," the meaning is that his presentation is dominated, not by theological ideas or controversial tendency, but by religious sentiment having its root either in the personal idiosyncrasy of the writer, or in his considerate regard to the edification of his first readers.

The character of Christ had heights and depths fitted to test severely the powers of comprehension not merely of crude disciples, but even of experienced, mature Apostles

¹ *E.g.*, the remarkable word in *Matthew* xxvi. 13, *Mark* xiv. 9: "Whosoever this gospel shall be preached in all the world," etc.

and Evangelists. Two ways of dealing with the harder sayings and doings are conceivable. An Evangelist might relate all he knew as it happened, and leave his story to make its own impression, loyally trusting that the character described, even though it should be in some respects above his own comprehension, would eventually in its every feature commend itself to the minds and consciences of all believers. Or he might, so to speak, take the character of Jesus in charge, and allow nothing to appear which was "over the head" of the reporter, or which he feared might prove a stumbling-block to those whose religious benefit he had primarily in view in writing. Which of these two ways of discharging the Evangelist's very responsible function is the wiser, it is needless to discuss; perhaps both are justifiable in given circumstances. Anyhow, the fact is that Mark (and Matthew also) has chosen the former way, and Luke, so far as one can judge, the latter. At all events, the phenomena of his Gospel are such as fit into that hypothesis. There are many facts bearing that complexion, however they are to be explained. I shall exhibit them with some measure of fulness, believing that in this case also a fearless discussion will be found to make for the historicity of the evangelic tradition. And for the more complete inductive verification of Luke's method, I shall briefly note also some instances of his discreet manner of dealing with materials relating to the disciples, though not they, but their Master be our theme. It may be best to dispose of them first.

Luke, it has been said by a very reverent commentator,¹ "ever spares the twelve." As a matter of fact his narratives, compared with those of Matthew and Mark, uniformly treat the disciples with considerate gentleness. How true this is, cannot be adequately shown by a cursory reference to illustrative instances; the passages must be carefully

¹ Schanz, a Catholic professor in Tübingen.

perused and compared with the parallels in the other Gospels. Yet even the hastiest glance will suffice to make a *primâ facie* impression in the direction of our thesis.

Take then, to begin with, the treatment of *Peter*. The stern word, "Get thee behind me, Satan," is omitted. But most characteristic is the manner in which the most humiliating event in Peter's disciple life, his denial of his Lord, is dealt with. The pre-intimation of the coming fall is most gently handled. The harshness of the announcement, "thou shalt deny me thrice," is softened by a prefatory statement, in which by an allusion to Satan Peter's case is virtually placed beside that of Job, and the experience is likened to a sifting process whereby a saintly character will be purged of its weak, chaff-like elements, the result of all to be that the sifted man shall become the strongest man of the apostolic band, having it for his honourable vocation to succour weaker brethren.¹ And what a benignant understatement is the account of the denial! No mention of cursing and swearing. The three denials form an anti-climax each succeeding one weaker than the one going before. In the first, Peter denies all knowledge of Jesus; in the second, only *intimate* knowledge, *discipleship*; and the last, occurring an hour later than the one preceding, is rather an *evasion* than a denial: A Galilean, say you? Yes, I am, and I don't understand what you are saying.²

The whole body of the Twelve are treated with equal consideration. Their faults, ignorance, weak faith, mutual rivalries, while acknowledged in loyalty to truth, are touched with a very sparing hand. Some narratives in which these appear in a glaring manner are conspicuous by their absence. To the omitted incidents belong the conversation concerning the leaven of the Pharisees, in which, as Mark reports it, Jesus complains of the hardness of their hearts, and asks

¹ *Luke* xxii. 31, 32.

² *Luke* xxii. 54-62; compare with *Mark* xiv. 66-72.

reproachfully, Do not ye yet understand? ¹ the ambitious request of the two sons of Zebedee, in which the discord within the disciple-circle appears in its most acute form, ² and the anointing in Bethany, in which the Twelve show a prosaic incapacity to appreciate the pathetic, poetic deed of Mary. ³ To be noted also in this connection is Luke's silence concerning the flight of the disciples at the apprehension of their Master. Even more instructive than this silence is the mild, delicate way in which the faults of the future apostles are dealt with by the Evangelist when he is compelled to speak of them. Take, *e.g.*, their weak faith. In the storm on the lake, on the eastward voyage towards Gerasa, as reported by Matthew and Mark, Jesus characterises the behaviour of His disciples as cowardly, and as exhibiting a lack of faith. ⁴ In Luke's report, with just the slightest accent of reproach in His tone, He asks, "Where is your faith?" ⁵ Again, at the foot of the hill of Transfiguration, the disciples, in Matthew, ask, Why could not we cast it out? and receive for reply, Because of your little faith; the Master going on to indicate what mighty deeds could be wrought by the smallest grain of faith, as if to insinuate that they had none at all. ⁶ This conversation, connected with the case of the epileptic boy, Luke omits. The saying concerning faith as a grain of mustard seed he does report, but in a characteristically different setting. The Apostles say unto their Lord, Increase our faith; and He replies, "If (as is the case) ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamore tree, Be thou rooted up and be thou planted in the sea, and it would have obeyed you," ⁷ the implied assertion being that they have already

¹ *Mark* viii. 11-21; for another strong reflection on the ignorance of the disciples, *vide* chap. vii. 18.

² *Mark* x. 35-44; *Matt.* xx. 20-28.

³ *Mark* xiv. 3-11; *Matt.* xxvi. 6-13.

⁴ *Matt.* viii. 26; *Mark* iv. 40.

⁶ *Matt.* xvii. 19, 20.

⁵ *Luke* viii. 25.

⁷ *Luke* xvii. 5, 6.

enough to achieve marvels. Note again how the Evangelist disposes of the rivalry among the companions of Jesus. He selects as the place for mentioning it the story of the Last Supper on the eve of the Passion. Truly a most unseemly time for disciples to indulge in ambitious passions! How then is the outbreak dealt with? Jesus first utters the words of admonition which, according to Matthew and Mark, He spoke on the occasion when James and John made their ambitious request. Then He goes on immediately after to pronounce a generous eulogy on the contending disciples: "Ye are they which have continued with Me in My temptations";¹ so, as it were, dwarfing into insignificance the petty fault of temper in comparison with the heroic fidelity. Just one point more I barely mention here: Luke's apology for the failure of the disciples to keep awake when their Master was in Gethsemane. "Sleeping *for sorrow!*"² How true it is that he ever spares the Twelve! Doubtless the fact was so, but he is careful to note it.

But it is with Luke's portraiture of our Lord that we are mainly concerned; I proceed, therefore, to indicate some of the things in his Gospel which lend distinctiveness to his picture.

1. Among these fall to be mentioned some notable *omissions*, more especially some of the more remarkable words reported by the other Evangelists as having been spoken by Jesus. Some have been referred to already in a previous paper, such as the realistic word concerning that which defileth,³ the seemingly harsh word about "dogs" spoken to the woman of Canaan,⁴ and the stern rebuke administered to Peter: "Get thee behind me, Satan." Another very noticeable omission is the saying concerning *eunuchism* for the kingdom of heaven, for

¹ Luke xxii. 28.

² Luke xxii. 45.

³ Matt. xv. 17, 18; Mark vii. 18, 19.

⁴ Matt. xv. 26; Mark vii. 27.

which we are indebted to Matthew.¹ Still more remarkable is the omission of the awful cry of Jesus on the cross: "My God, My God!"² In some respects the most surprising omission of all is the very important word spoken by Jesus on the occasion of the ambitious request of James and John: "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many."³ What gives this omission special claims on our attention is the fact that it seems on first view one of those words which, assuming his acquaintance with it, Luke would have taken pains to preserve. Its omission is a problem to be solved in connection with his Gospel. But this is only a part of the problem. This particular saying is one of four containing Christ's teaching concerning the significance of His death, *all* of which, with one very doubtful exception, are wanting in the Third Gospel. This is a fact the reason and meaning of which deserve careful consideration, and they will be considered in a future paper. Meantime I simply note this as one of the peculiarities of Luke, and pass on to a second class of phenomena which make this Evangelist's picture of Jesus so distinctive.

2. The things which are strongly *emphasised*. First, let it be remarked in general that there *are* such phenomena in the Third Gospel. Luke does not always tone down and deal in mitigated statements. He can be as emphatic and realistic as either of his brother Evangelists when it suits his purpose, and this very occasional emphasis gives added significance to the opposite quality of subdued expression observable in some of his narratives. Among the instances in which he does not shrink from strong sayings are his reports of words spoken by our Lord in reference to wealth and its possessors. The hard

¹ *Matt.* xix. 12.² *Matt.* xxvii. 46; *Mark* xv. 34.³ *Matt.* xx. 28; *Mark* x. 45.

saying concerning the camel and the needle's eye finds a place in his pages.¹ It is in his Gospel we find the woes pronounced on the rich, the full, and the merry.² In the parables of the *Unjust Steward* and *Dives*³ riches almost seem to be in themselves evil, and the bare fact of possessing them appears to be represented as a ground of perdition. It may be only an appearance, but it is there, requiring explanation; and the thing to be noted is that the Evangelist takes no pains in this case to prevent misapprehension. The fact may be due in part to the nature of his own social sympathies, partly to his knowing that there was no risk of any of his readers stumbling over such sayings of the Lord.

Luke emphasises whatever tends to bring out into strong relief the *power*, the *benevolence*, and the *saintliness* of Jesus. His desire to make prominent the two former of these attributes is apparent in his narratives of healing acts. Peter's mother-in-law is ill of a *great* fever,⁴ and the leper is *full* of leprosy,⁵ and in the story of the blind man at Jericho care is taken to make it appear a case of *total* blindness by representing the sufferer as needing some one to conduct him to the presence of Jesus.⁶ There is no good ground for regarding these statements as exaggerations, but it is legitimate to see in them a wish to make the cure effected stand out in the full measure of its marvellousness. The greatness of the benefit conferred, that is the benevolence of the Healer, is also rendered prominent by many a slight but significant touch. The withered hand restored on a Sabbath is the *right*⁷ hand, most useful for labour; the centurion's servant is one *dear* to him;⁸ the son of the widow of Nain is an *only* son;⁹

¹ Luke xviii. 24.

³ Luke xvi.

⁵ Luke v. 12.

⁷ Luke vi. 6.

⁹ Luke vii. 12.

² Luke vi. 24, 25.

⁴ Luke iv. 38.

⁶ Luke xviii. 40.

⁸ Luke vii. 2.

the daughter of Jairus an *only* daughter;¹ the epileptic boy at the foot of the hill of Transfiguration is also an only child.²

The *holiness* of the Lord Jesus is carefully accentuated in this Gospel. The call of Peter to discipleship, which here assumes larger proportions and greater significance than it possesses in Matthew and Mark, is made to contribute to this end. Here Peter is the great disciple, the representative man among the Twelve, therefore his call is related with much circumstantiality, while that of the others, James, John, and Andrew, is thrown into the shade. Yet even he, the pillar-Apostle of future years, in view of the marvellous take of fishes, exclaims, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." The foremost of the disciples feels himself unworthy to join the society of the Holy One.³

In every saintly character *prayer*, a devotional spirit, forms a prominent feature. This trait in the character of the Lord Jesus is accordingly made very prominent in Luke's Gospel. After the healing of the leper Jesus withdraws into lonely spots to pray.⁴ The teaching on the hill is inaugurated by a night spent in prayer.⁵ Prayer formed the prelude to the momentous communications on the Messiahship and the approaching Passion;⁶ likewise to the mysterious Transfiguration scene.⁷ Sometimes the Master prayed alone, sometimes in the presence of His disciples. Hearing Him pray in a certain place awoke in them a desire for instruction in an art in which they felt the Master left them far behind.⁸ He prayed *for* them as well as in their hearing; for Peter, for example, when the hour of his trial was nigh.⁹

¹ Luke viii. 42.

³ Luke v. 8.

⁵ Luke vi. 12.

⁷ Luke ix. 29.

⁹ Luke xxii. 32.

² Luke ix. 38.

⁴ Luke v. 16.

⁶ Luke ix. 18.

⁸ Luke xi. 1.

3. I pass now to the category of *under-statement*, things presented in a subdued light. Both words and acts of Jesus fall to be noticed here. To the former belong the words spoken at Capernaum in reference to the discussion that had arisen within the disciple-circle on the question: Who is the greatest? According to the report of Matthew, the Master then spoke two very stern words, one directly addressed to the disciples, the other bearing on the doom due to the man who, in the pursuit of ambitious ends, should cause any little one to stumble. In the former disciples are threatened with exclusion from the kingdom unless their disposition undergo a change, and ambitious passions give place to a childlike spirit. In the latter it is intimated that the fate deserved by the offender of the little ones is that a large millstone (literally one driven by an ass, as opposed to a small one worked by the hand) be hanged about his neck, and that he be drowned in the deepest part of the sea.¹ Words, both, expressive of passionate abhorrence of selfish ambition and the mischief it works, by the utterance of which Jesus commands our admiration and inspires in our hearts holy awe. But Luke has dealt with these solemn sayings in a way which prevents them from having their full effect, toning down the millstone logion so that it loses its note of indignant intensity,² and transferring the other to a different occasion, where it loses the personal reference to the disciples, and becomes a general declaration as to the necessity of childlikeness for admission into the kingdom of heaven. The new setting is furnished by the incident of the mothers bringing their little children to be blessed by Jesus,³ which,

¹ Matt. xviii. 3, 6.

² Luke xvii. 2: The ass-millstone becomes a millstone simply, and "the sea" stands in place of "the depth of the sea." Luke gives neither of the sayings in connection with the Capernaum discourse on humility. *Vide* chap. ix. 46-48.

³ Luke xviii. 15-17.

I may remark in passing, supplies a fresh instance of Luke's habit of sparing the Twelve. Mark tells that Jesus was much displeased with His disciples for trying to keep the children from His presence.¹ Of this the third Evangelist says nothing. The omission has the same effect as the toning down of the words under consideration. Both keep the *indignation* of Jesus out of view, and suggest the idea of one who was always calm in temper and passionlessly didactic in speech. Whether this passionlessness entered into the Evangelist's own idea of sanctity, or whether in so reporting the Lord's words he was considering what his readers could bear, it may be difficult to determine. What is certain is that the character of Jesus thus portrayed gains in amiability at the cost of its power and majesty.

A similar observation is suggested by Luke's treatment of our Lord's anti-Pharisaic protest. Two facts have to be noticed here: extensive omission, and a new setting given to much that is retained. As to the former, so much has been left out that from Luke's Gospel alone it would be quite impossible to obtain any adequate idea of the viciousness of Pharisaic religion, or of the thoroughness and exhaustiveness of the criticism which Jesus directed against it. In proof of this statement it will suffice to mention the omission of the great body of the Sermon on the Mount, consisting of an elaborate contrast between righteousness as conceived by the scribes and the righteousness of the kingdom as conceived by the Preacher, and also of one-half of the great final philippic against Pharisaism as recorded in Matthew xxiii. But it is the setting of what is retained that at present concerns us. It strikes me as most characteristic and instructive. The fact here is that much of what Luke reports of our Lord's anti-Pharisaic discourses appears in his Gospel as spoken

¹ Mark x. 14.

not merely *about* Pharisees but *to* them by Jesus sitting as a guest at their tables. On three distinct occasions Jesus appears in his pages as a guest in the houses of Pharisees, and speaks His mind about their ways with urbanity and yet with freedom.¹ Of such semi-friendly social relations there is no trace in Matthew and Mark, and we might easily take away from their narratives the impression that such relations were impossible. That might be a hasty inference. It may be taken for granted that Jesus would not refuse such invitations, and that He would be true to Himself wherever He was. On the other hand, it is equally certain that His attitude towards Pharisaism was uncompromising and His speech about it, especially at the end, crushing and tremendous. And the thing to be noted about Luke is that he mitigates the severity of the sterner utterances by giving as table-talk what in Matthew's Gospel appears as part of a solemn final protest in Jerusalem against the religious guides of Israel and all their ways.²

The chief instances of pruned statement concerning the *actions* of Jesus are the narratives of the Cleansing of the Temple and the Agony in the Garden. The latter will fall to be considered at a later stage of these studies; therefore for the present I content myself with a few words on the former. Of the three synoptical Evangelists, Mark describes the scene in the strongest colours, but both Matthew and he tell the story in substantially the same way. In both Jesus not merely speaks in a tone of indignant remonstrance, but acts with a stormy energy that might easily be mistaken for violence, overturning the tables of the money-changers and the seats of them that sold the doves. He makes a clean sweep of the unholy traffic within the sacred precincts, unceremoniously turning out not merely those that

¹ Luke vii. 36-50, xi. 37-52, xiv. 1-24.

² Vide in chap. xi. 37 ff.

sold but also those that bought as art and part in the work of desecration. Of this animated transaction, Luke offers a very reduced and unsensational account, telling how Jesus, entering the temple, began to cast out them that *sold*, making no mention of the overturned tables and seats, adding only the complaint: It is written, And My house shall be a house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of robbers.¹ His report gives really no idea of the scene; the one vivid feature is the comparison of the desecrated temple to a robber's den. And yet from that strong utterance one might suspect that there was something behind left unsaid. It seems to be a half-told tale, as if adapted to the capacities of spiritual minors, who would find it difficult to reconcile the strenuous conduct of Jesus with their preconceived ideas of His character. Probably what interested Luke himself was not the drastic action of the Lord Jesus, but the verdict He pronounced on the Holy House as no longer holy, justifying beforehand that still more drastic action of Providence by which the temple had been turned into a heap of ruins. Whatever the reason, the fact is that in this case, as in others, the third Evangelist presents a picture of Jesus which lacks the element of *tragic grandeur*.

4. For this defect he amply compensates by the attractive exhibition which he makes of the *grace* of Jesus, especially in the *additions* he contributes to the common stock of evangelic traditions.

Luke's additions, though not exclusively, are predominantly, such as serve this valuable purpose. They may for the most part be described by the happy phrase he employs to indicate the character of Christ's address in the synagogue of Nazareth: "words of grace."² He had evidently taken pains to collect material of this kind. There is no

¹ Luke xix. 45: the words "them that bought" have no place in the best MS. copies of the Greek Testament, and are omitted in the Revised Version.

² Luke iv. 22.

reason to doubt the historicity of his collections. The statement in his preface justifies the assumption that for every one of his narratives he had a voucher in oral or in written tradition. Then there is intrinsic probability on the side of his peculiar contributions. Love to the sinful and the social outcasts was unquestionably a most outstanding charism of Jesus. Most authentic sayings of His, such as "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners," and "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost," entitle us to look for illustrative anecdotes in the memorabilia of His public ministry. Instead of questioning the truth of those Luke has preserved, we rather wonder at the paucity of such material in the companion Gospels. We feel sure that interesting stories of the relations of Jesus with the sinful, and of His sayings about them, might be forthcoming, if pains were taken to collect them. Luke happily has taken pains, possibly in part because he noticed a lack in Matthew or in Mark, and felt he must set himself to supply it. What he has given by way of supplement is very welcome as well as very credible. The story of the woman in Simon's house¹ is pure evangelic gold. So are the exquisite parables concerning the joy of finding things lost.² The same grace-revealing character belongs to the Parables of the Good Samaritan,³ the Great Supper,⁴ and the Pharisee and the Publican.⁵ They foster the saving instinct, and hold out hope to those who need to be succoured and saved. The last-named is described as a parable concerning those who trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and *despised others*. Its aim is to condemn not merely the self-complacency, but more especially the contempt, and to encourage the despised by letting them know that they were

¹ Luke vii. 36-50.

³ Luke x. 25-37.

⁵ Luke xviii. 9-14.

² Luke xv.

⁴ Luke xiv. 15-24.

at least not beyond the sympathies of *God*. The winsome stories of Zacchæus¹ and the penitent thief² worthily crown a collection of gleanings which fully justify the encomium on Luke's Gospel that it is "the Gospel of the sinful."

Little needs to be added by way of summarising the results of the foregoing discussion. The particulars under the four heads of omissions, emphasised statements, understatements, and additions, all conspire to one end, viz., to exhibit the Lord of the Church divine in *Power*, *Holiness*, and *Goodness*. The holiness of Jesus is so zealously guarded that He appears not only without sin but even free from all that bears the most remote resemblance to moral infirmity in temper, word, or action. The result is that the natural individuality of Jesus, so conspicuous in Mark, is seen in Luke only in faded outline. Luke's picture of Jesus is one-sided. The side shown is indeed so attractive that we thank the Evangelist for what he has given rather than blame him for what he has withheld. Yet we ought distinctly to see, and acknowledge to ourselves, that his presentation is defective. We cannot accept as complete a Christ who is simply good and kind. We need a Christ who can be angry, indignant, terrible in passionate abhorrence of evil; who can hurl thunder-bolts of denunciation at the "unwedgeable and gnarled oak" of powerful, privileged, and plausible iniquity. The love of Jesus to the sinful, as it appears in this Gospel, is beautiful; but the hatred of Pharisaism which is somewhat thrown into the background is equally indispensable. So likewise is the stern purpose, at all costs, to purge out of the disciples evil elements of temper which, left unchecked, would soon turn the new society of which they were to form the nucleus into a community little better in spirit than that in which the scribes bore sway. Who that considers to

¹ Luke xix. 1-10.

² Luke xxiii. 39-43.

what extent Christianity has been wrecked by priestly assumption can regret that the evangelic records have so faithfully shown how contrary that heaven was to the mind of the Lord Jesus?

The view I have ventured to present of Luke's treatment of the evangelic tradition, in so far as it concerns the persons of Jesus and His disciples, can be turned to some account for apologetic purposes. It makes for the historicity of the Synoptical records. The remark applies even to Luke's omissions. These at first view seem to cast a dark shadow of doubt on the historical value of the material omitted. We are inclined to argue: if Luke had known these things, he would have reported them; and how could a man who took such pains to inform himself fail to know them if they had been actual facts? When the element of intention is introduced, this reasoning falls to the ground. We then perceive that there were classes of facts which the Evangelist would not care to preserve. Things not known, therefore presumably not real, become things probably known which the Evangelist did not choose to introduce into his narrative. At the very least, intentional omission, once established, cancels all presumption against historicity. On the other hand, abridged or qualified reporting bears positive evidence to the reality of the fact reported. Whatever a writer tones down he is tempted to omit. In adopting the course of understating rather than omitting he becomes, so to speak, a reluctant witness to the historicity of the materials so dealt with. Finally, even heightened statements in their own way contribute to the cumulative apologetic argument. If the added elements be the result of fuller information, this is self-evident. Even if they be exaggerations for a purpose, they tend to establish the truth of the basal narrative. They show within what narrow limits editorial discretion was willing to restrict itself. An author who has ideas to embody is tempted to

invent when he cannot find. Luke did not invent, but only at most touched up stories given to his hand by a reliable tradition. This is his method in narratives common to his Gospel with those of Matthew and Mark. Noting this, we can well believe it to have been his method all through, even in those portions of his Gospel where he is our sole authority.

A. B. BRUCE.

ON SOME PHRASES IN THE RAISING OF LAZARUS.

I. (John xi. 33, *ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι*). The regular meaning of the word *ἐμβριμᾶσθαι*¹ is "threaten loudly," "be noisily angry." Yet some of the Synoptists use the word of Jesus as though He "threatened," or "was angry with," those whom He cured.² Such a tradition might naturally cause difficulty to educated readers, especially at the beginning of the second century, when people were familiar with the tricks of those exorcists who pretended to drive out evil spirits and to cure diseases by shouting at their patients and terrifying them into a stupor that might seem to be recovery.

Hence the Fourth Evangelist appears to have thought it well to use this misunderstood word in such a context as to demonstrate that it had not the meaning popularly associated with it. How could it mean anger of the common kind, since Jesus (xi. 57) "wept" almost in the same moment? And that it referred to some more inward and suppressed feeling was denoted by the qualification (xi. 33)

¹ Rev., in text, has "groaned." But there is no authority for "groan," and abundant authority for "be angry," "threaten loudly," "bellow," or similar meanings.

² Mark says that Jesus (Mark i. 43) "threatened, or reproached (*ἐνεβριμήσατο*)" a leper, that he should not make his cure known to others. Matthew ix. 30 (*ἐνεβριμήθη*) says the same of Jesus addressing two blind men.

"*in His spirit*," and then (xi. 38) "*in Himself*." If we ask what was the object of this internal anger, or rebuking, the author suggests, rather than gives, an answer. The Messiah, in this crowning sign, is figuratively overcoming what St. Paul calls "the last enemy that shall be overcome," that is to say, death—death material, as the type of death spiritual. If this be so, the object of Christ's stern though suppressed wrath would seem to be "the Prince of this world" regarded as the author of death and sin.

II. (John xi. 33, "ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν, He troubled Himself.") This expression, unique in the Bible amid frequent uses of the passive "to be troubled," seems intended to have a unique meaning. It will be best appreciated by examining, first, the ancient Messianic uses of the phrase in the passive; then, any Synoptic passages that bear on them; lastly, the Johannine use of the word.

The Psalms abound with passages in which the Psalmist cries, "My heart, or soul, is troubled (ἐταράχθη)." But it is only in Psalms xlii., xliii. that the words come as a refrain thrice repeated, "Why art thou full of grief, O my soul (περίλυπος εἶ, ἡ ψυχή μου), and why dost thou *fill me with trouble* (συνταράσσεις)?" Comp. Psalm xlii. 7: "My soul *is troubled* within me (πρὸς ἑμαυτόν ἡ ψυχή μου ἐταράχθη)."

This word "full of grief" is found *only here in the canonical O.T.* In N.T. also it is very rare, but Jesus is represented as using it before His thrice-repeated prayer in Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 34, Matt. xxvi. 38), "*My soul is full of grief* (περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου) even unto death." Luke omits these words, possibly for the same reason for which he omits the words given by Mark and Matthew (Mark xv. 34, Matt. xxvii. 46), "Why hast Thou forsaken Me?"

Now, from the analogy of abundant instances, we may

anticipate that what the Third Gospel thus omits the Fourth will insert, but in some quite new shape that shall bring out its latent spiritual meaning. In the place of the cry "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" it substitutes—probably from a Psalm with a somewhat similar beginning (lxiii. 1, "God, my God, *or*, God is my God . . . my soul thirsteth for Thee")—"I thirst," as though Christ's meaning were, *not that He reproached the Father for absence, but that He longed for the Father's immediate presence*. So here, what the first two Gospels express by "full of grief" (from Psalm xlii. 6) the Fourth expresses by a word (*ταράσσειν*) almost identical with that found in the same sentence of the same Psalm (*συνταράσσειν*). No other author in the N.T. uses the word "to be troubled" except of timorousness, or the fears of distrust, or the doubts of a bad conscience, or the confused alarms of a mob; and this very author represents Jesus as saying to the disciples (xiv. 1), "Let *not* your heart *be troubled*." Yet here, not content with speaking of Christ's "heart" or "soul," he represents Christ Himself, as subjected to "trouble."

Is the difficulty increased or diminished by the peculiar form of the expression, "He troubled *Himself*"? At first sight, it may seem increased; for the phrase seems fatal to the genuineness of the "trouble." And so it would be if it were literally taken, apart from ancient traditions and controversies. But we have to bear in mind that the Psalm represents a dialogue between the Psalmist and his soul, in which the latter is as it were personified and remonstrated with on its action. "Why art thou so disquieted within me?" says the Hebrew: and the Greek is still stronger, "Why dost thou fill me with trouble?"—as though the "soul" were conflicting with the man. Now we learn from Origen (*Cels.*, ii. 9, and comp. vii. 55) that such passages as those above quoted from the Synoptists were used

by antagonists for the purpose of decrying Jesus; and Origen protests against the supposition that Christians believe either the body or the soul of Jesus to be God—"the soul about which is uttered the saying, 'My soul is *full of grief*.'" What Origen thus protests negatively, our Evangelist seems to be protesting positively, namely, that the Being whom we worship as Divine is one in whom there is no conflict between the Divine and the human. He asserts, not that Christ's "trouble" was unreal, but that He *spontaneously took the "trouble" into Himself*, in harmonious obedience to the will of the Father and to the dictates of His own love for man. So far from artificially rousing the mere semblance of "trouble," the Divine Nature—knowing sin in contrast to perfect righteousness—was capable of feeling infinitely keener "trouble" than imperfect humanity can feel. But, with all its keenness, it was voluntary. He was the Son, and one with the Father in will and act. What the Father did, the Son did. The Father "troubled" the Son? Then the Son "troubled" *Himself*.

Another motive also could hardly fail to be in the author's mind—a desire to correct the prevalent Stoic teaching about "trouble." The fundamental precept in the *Encheiridion* is, "Be free from trouble (*ἀράπαχος*)."
 "Troubles," the author tells us (*Ench.*, 5), "arise not from facts but from fancies." No one ought to be ever "troubled (*ταράσσεσθαι*)."
 A man may be allowed to pretend to be "troubled" and "grieved" out of sympathy with others; just as one may "pretend" in playing games with children. But to be really troubled is foolish and wrong and faithless. Such sayings are scattered broadcast over the Lectures of Epictetus.

There was a truth in this doctrine, and it accords, as we have seen, with words of Jesus. To be "troubled," in a sense, is to be unbelieving: (John xiv. 1) "Let not your

heart *be troubled*, neither let it play the coward. Ye *believe* in God? *Believe* also in Me." No man who perfectly "believed" in Jesus could ever be so "troubled" as to disturb the fundamental peace on which his spiritual life finds footing. But on the other hand, there are possibilities of what may be called surface-trouble, yet trouble sincere and painful, for all those who recognise—what Epictetus did not recognise—that there is a devil as well as a God, and that God Himself is to be regarded as conflicting against evil, and (in the person of His Son) suffering in the conflict. Because St. Paul felt this "trouble," he became a living power and drew multitudes to Christ through himself; because Epictetus did not feel it, he remained, comparatively speaking, a passive monument of the nobility of patience.

It is the object of our Evangelist to show that, if at any time the Logos gave up the calm, or *ataraxia*, on which philosophers set so high a price, it was, in the first place, in conformity with the Divine laws of the universe—just as the wind, blowing on the waters, keeps them sweet and pure, or as God's Wind (or Breath, or Spirit) moved on the abysmal water in the beginning in order to impart the harmony of spiritual life; and in the next place, He was thus "troubled," not for Himself, but for the human race. Out of this "trouble"—as in the beginning, so now—there sprang words of Creation—in Genesis, "Let there be light," and there was light, light out of darkness, and order out of chaos; in the Gospel, "Lazarus, hither, forth!" and man came forth, bound hand and foot, but living, and delivered from the cave of death.

The Divine mystery of the "trouble" of the Logos is thrice mentioned, and it ends in a climax. Here the Logos troubles the Logos. Presently we shall find the Logos (xii. 27) "troubled" in "*soul*." Last of all (xiii. 21) He is "troubled in *spirit*."

III. (John xi. 43, “ἐκπαύρασεν, he cried aloud”). The word (xi. 43) *κραυγάξεν* (six times used in the Fourth Gospel), “cry aloud,” “clamour,” “shriek,” occurs in N.T. (apart from Acts xxii. 23 of a crowd “clamouring”) only in Matthew xii. 19, quoting Isaiah xlii. 2 concerning the Messiah, “He shall not *cry aloud* (*κραυγάσει*) (LXX. *κεκράξεται*).” The prophecy continues: “. . . He shall bring forth judgment in truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged till He have set judgment on the earth.”

Matthew is apparently dissatisfied with the LXX. translation. How could it be denied that the Messiah did “cry” (Matt. xxvii. 50, *κράξας*) on the cross? There were three ways of removing the difficulty. (1) The word *κεκράξεται* being retained, it might be urged that the “crying aloud” did not take place till Christ’s death, when He *had* “brought forth judgment to victory”; so that *κράξας* in Matthew xxvii. 50 was justifiable. Or (2) *κεκράξεται* might be changed, *e.g.*, into *κραυγάσει*, “shriek,” or “clamour”; and this, it might be said, Christ *never did*. Or (3) the Evangelist might avoid using the word *κράξεν* altogether concerning Christ. Mark and Luke adopt this third course; Matthew adopts the second. The Fourth Gospel (vii. 28, 37, xii. 44) records that Christ on three solemn occasions “cried (*ἔκραξε*),” but that, on this single occasion, He “cried *aloud* (*ἐκπαύρασε*),” *i.e.* with a sound of the nature of a clamour or multitudinous cry of distress. This is all the more noteworthy because John subsequently uses the latter almost non-Biblical word (xii. 13, xviii. 40, xix. 6, 12, 15) to denote the outcry of a crowd, in the first instance applauding Jesus, in the rest seeking His death. Why does he apply to Jesus on this single occasion a word so apparently unsuitable, *applied to Him by no other Evangelist, and expressly disavowed by the first of the three?*

The answer extends beyond a mere verbal dissimilarity between the three Evangelists and the fourth. It affects

their several conceptions of Christ's last moments. Although Matthew alone uses *κράζειν* of Jesus on the cross, yet the three Synoptists agree that Jesus cried with "a loud utterance (*φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*)" (Mark xv. 37; Matt. xxvii. 50; Luke xxiii. 46). John, on the other hand, uses simply (xix. 26=30) "say" (*λέγει, εἶπεν*) of the last utterances of Jesus, while he selects, as the single occasion for a "loud utterance (*φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*)" on the part of Jesus, the moment now under consideration, when He is figuratively rescuing mankind from death, and "bringing forth judgment unto victory." Having regard to the remarkable rarity of *κραυγάζειν* in the Bible, and to our Evangelist's necessary acquaintance with the quotation in Matthew and with the controversies that were sure to arise out of it, we seem safe in concluding that he had these controversies in mind when writing this description of a supreme Messianic "sign" in which every step was to be the fulfilment of some type or prediction.

But at the same time a deeper thought is revealed in the frequency with which he subsequently applies the word to the multitude, only once "shouting" or "screaming" for the Messiah, four times "shouting" or "screaming" against Him. It is essentially a word of weakness, often indicating passion and want of self-control. The author appears to suggest that, on the single occasion when the Redeemer allowed Himself to overpass the calm that characterized His utterances, it was not in any cry uttered for Himself from the cross, but when He was crying aloud for Lazarus "bound hand and foot," for Lazarus whom He "loved," and therein for the world which He came to save. The Apocalypse had taught that from the New Jerusalem God would banish (Rev. xxi. 41) "every tear" and all "crying (*κραυγῇ*)."

This Gospel carries us a step further. Before that consummation could arrive, the Messiah Himself must endure to pour forth "tears" (xi. 35, *ἐδάκρυσεν*)

and to utter "crying." But how this great truth was liable to misunderstanding may be gathered from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which asserts that the Messiah (v. 7) "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears (*κραυγῆς καὶ δακρύων*) unto Him that was able to save Him from death." Whatever truth there may have been in the supposition that Christ so identified Himself with the sinful world that He entertained in His mind (not as a doubt of His own, but as a Satanic thought to be wrestled with and overthrown) the possibility that He too, together with those whom He had come to save, might not be saved from "the last enemy of all"—the Evangelist felt that at least it must be erroneous to impute to the Saviour, in His deepest sufferings, a self-regarding attitude. Such an imputation he contradicts here. There were indeed "tears," there was indeed "crying aloud"; but they were not for Himself. On the cross there was no "crying" and no "tears," nothing but quiet "saying," indicative of thought for others ("Woman, behold thy Son"), or of an absorbing thirst for the Father's presence ("I thirst"), or of a delight in having accomplished His will ("It is accomplished"). But what Christ could not do for Himself, He could do for miserable mankind. There was a truth in the mocking reproach of the Pharisees, "He saved others, Himself He could not save." So here, He could not "weep" and "cry aloud" for Himself; He could for Lazarus.

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

JESUS OUR SUPREME TEACHER.

WHEN Jesus on one occasion (St. Matt. xxiii. 8) strictly enjoined His disciples that they should not allow any of their number to usurp mastership over his brethren, and commanded them to acknowledge Him as the alone Lord of the conscience, it is evident that He had in His mind the intolerable bondage of thought into which the religious people of His day had fallen. His own disheartening experience as the chief of God's prophets lent a keen edge to His words, and are a complete illustration of their meaning. No teacher ever gave such pledges of Divine authority as Jesus; no people could have been better prepared for His evangel than the Jews. They had been set apart as in a cloister that they might hear the Divine voice, and a succession of prophets had come from the presence of God to declare the Divine will. A nation had been trained in the hope of the Messiah to wait for the dayspring from on high and the fulness of God's kingdom. It might have been expected that this well-tilled field would have been open soil for Jesus' words, and one dares to believe that there might have been an auspicious seedtime had the Jews passed, say, from Isaiah to Jesus, or had Jesus come while the glow of Daniel's visions were still fresh.

Unfortunately between the last of the great prophets and the advent of Jesus there came in one of the secondary periods which follow on an age of inspiration, when the intellectual consciousness of a people, hitherto running full and free, comes to a standstill and stagnates. No teacher of the first order arose to continue the stream of revelation, but in his place appeared that lower order of mind to which the letter is everything, on which the Spirit never breathes. The scribes sat in the seat of the prophets, and revelation

was succeeded by exposition. Under the hand of rabbis without insight or imagination the life departed from Hebrew thought, and nothing was left but empty bloodless forms, as when a flower is plucked and dried. Theological pedantry had done its work in the days of Jesus, and had reduced the sublime ethics of the Old Testament to a wearisome absurdity. The beneficent law of rest, so full of sympathy with struggling people, was translated into a series of regulations of peddling detail and incredible childishness. The clean heart of the prophets sank into an endless washing of hands, and filial piety was wantonly outraged that the temple taxes might be swollen. Jewish faith had become a painted show, a husk in which the kernel had withered.

It is, on first thoughts, inexplicable that any body of religious people—and one must admit that the Jews were the most religious people on the face of the earth—should have refused the luminous and winsome teaching of Jesus, and actually sent Him to the Cross for His evangel. When one thinks a little longer, and puts himself in the place of the contemporaries of Jesus, it comes home to him that they were not really able to receive the truth, and that he himself might, in the same circumstances, have condemned Jesus as a blasphemer. For the irresistible attraction of Jesus, as it now seems to us, was his reasonableness, and that was shown by His appeal at every turn to reality. "This is what I say, and you will see that this is what ought to be," was ever Jesus' argument, and to an honest mind, without bias or preoccupation, such a plea was unanswerable. But if the mind had long lost touch with truth at first hand, and was possessed by traditions about truth, then Jesus could have no access; and indeed might be only offensive. Jesus and the Jews were ever at cross purposes in this matter. He made His appeal past tradition to truth, and they disallowed this appeal and judged Him by tra-

dition, and by this standard there can be no doubt He was a heretic.

Jesus' attitude to tradition was quite clear, and consistent. It is not to be supposed that He denied the right or propriety of Jewish scholars studying and theorizing about the Old Testament Scriptures, for this were to cramp the just exercise of human reason. He would no doubt consider it a fitting tribute to revelation that earnest and able men should reason truth out unto her farthest conclusions and lessons for the guidance both of conscience and intellect. As it happened, the work of a sterile age did not yield much either of light or strength to generations following. But that was its misfortune, not its crime: the rabbis so far were within their rights and their duty. Theology, either in the department of dogma or ethics, requires no justification; it only calls for limitation. As soon as they proposed to bind their results upon their fellow-men with authority the scribes passed beyond their province and were guilty of treason against the free commonwealth of God's children. As dictators of faith and manners, Jesus resisted them without reserve or compromise, and forbade His followers to follow in their steps. The spiritual arrogance of the rabbis had been a blight on Judaism, and Jesus desired that His new religion should retain a perennial freshness. There was only one guarantee that Christianity would not share the same fate, and that was the continual return to Jesus.

When Jesus laid this injunction on His Apostles, He surely anticipated the history of His faith, and circumstances have justified His foresight. It is a necessity of the human mind to theorize about truth; it is a calamity to substitute theories for truth. One almost despairs at times because we seem the victims of an irresistible tendency to ignore the real, and to be content with the artificial. No sooner has some man of genius painted a picture or

conceived a poem, or even made a speech with moral intention, than people set themselves to invent amazing meanings and applications, and raise such a dust of controversy that the original effect is utterly lost. We are amused by the societies which are the custodians of Ruskin and Browning, but none can be indifferent to the manipulation of Jesus' words. If Jesus' delicate poetry be reduced to prose, and the fair, carved work of His parables be used for the building of prisons, and His lovely portrait of God be "restored" with grotesque colouring, and His lucid principles of life be twisted into harassing regulations, then Jesus has been much wronged, and the world has suffered irreparable loss. This is the disaster Jesus dreaded, and no one will deny that it has, in some degree at least, come to pass.

The footsteps of the holy Apostles had scarcely died away—concerning whose relation to Jesus something might be said—before the Fathers arose, and became, with the lapse of time, lords of the Christian conscience. Great theologians of the Middle Ages gradually took rank with the Fathers, while council after council, from Nice to Trent, saddled their accumulated dogmas on the Church. Chief Reformers almost literally dictated creeds to nations, and the pragmatism of the 17th century forged a yoke of doctrines so minute, tedious, and unreasonable that it became too irksome even for our more patient fathers. Every side of truth and every rite of Jesus was turned into a test by which honest-minded and simple-hearted disciples of Jesus were tried, condemned, cast out, burned. Unity was as much wanting as charity, for Christians in the matter of creed agreed in nothing except in ignoring the Gospels and persecuting one another. Romans rest on the councils down to the one that affirmed the infallibility of the pope; an Anglican goes back to the early councils and the Fathers; a Lutheran measures his faith by the Confession of Augs-

burg; and the Scottish Church seems to suppose that Christianity was only once thoroughly understood, when an assembly of English divines met at Westminster. Bodies of Christian folk have also ignored Jesus' warning against Rabbinism, and have surrendered their birthright by allowing themselves to be called by the names of men, and so we have Socinians, Wesleyans, Cameronians, Morisonians, and what not. One denomination is called, with surely some slight want of humour, if not of reverence, "Lady Huntingdon's Connection"; and so it is made evident that a masterful woman can actually found a Church and lay down a creed. It comes as a shock on one to attend some heresy trial, and hear the prosecution quoting a foreign divine of almost miraculous woodenness and the defendant taking refuge in a second-rate commentator. If you were to ask, as is very natural, why neither will refer at once and finally to the words of Jesus, who can hardly have been silent on any point of importance, it would be at once explained that such a reference is an irrelevancy and a subterfuge, and one must admit that it would be an attempt to get behind the rabbis to Jesus. But does it matter much what any rabbi says? and is not the only vital question, What saith the Master?

There are certain rights which are legal; there are certain rights which are natural. No law can take away the latter, nor can a man divest himself of them by any form of engagement, and among the inherent rights of a Christian man is his appeal to Jesus as the one Judge of truth. It has often lain dormant in the Church; it has at times been powerfully exercised. Some one discovers that the water of life is clearer and sweeter from the spring than in a cistern, and shows the grass-grown path to the spring. Perhaps there has been no long period without some voice summoning Christians to break away from the tyranny of tradition and return to the liberty of Jesus.

This has been the work of all Reformers from Tauler to Luther, from Luther to Wesley—to unearth the evangel of Jesus from the mass of dogmas and rites which have overlaid it. Two parties have been in recurring conflict—the Traditionalists, who insist, “This is what our fathers have said, and what you must believe”; and the Evangelists, who declare, “This is what Jesus has said, and this only will we believe.” When Traditionalism has the upper hand, it burns its opponents, as the Roman Church did John Huss, or casts them out, as the Scotch Church did MacLeod Campbell; when Evangelism is strong, it clears an open space where men can breathe and see Jesus. By-and-by each evangelical movement loses its free spirit, and settles down into a new form of traditionalism. Brave hands clear away the covering from the ancient temple of truth, and then the generation following allow the sand-drift to cover its columns once more. It is a long battle between a handful of faithful men and the desert, and too often the desert has won.

The spirit of our day is so resentful of traditionalism as to be even impatient of theology, which is foolish; and to threaten faith, which would be ruin. No one, however, need be alarmed, for there is good reason to believe that the end will be the toleration of a noble science and the re-establishment of faith. When workmen come with pickaxe and shovel, it is either to destroy or discover, and the aim of present thought is discovery. Were earnest men rebelling against ancient dogmas because they were an integral part of Jesus’ teaching, this would be a very serious matter. This would be nothing short of a deliberate attack on Jesus. If they be only endeavouring to get past the results of theological science to the actual teaching of Jesus, then surely nothing could be more hopeful. This must issue in the revival of Christianity. There is no question that for some time dogmatic theology has been

at a discount. They say that both the Fathers and the Puritans are unsaleable, and this is to be regretted. But there can be little question that Biblical theology is at a premium, and this is of far more importance. Never have there been so many Lives of Jesus ; never have His words been so anxiously studied. This is as it ought to be, and every Protestant ought to lift up his head. For what did the Reformers of the 16th century contend, but the right of Christian men to build their faith at first hand on the words of Holy Scripture? We are living in a second Reformation, and it were an immense blunder for us to go back on the principle of all Reformations, and insist directly or indirectly that Protestant councils should come in between Christians and Christ. "When I say the religion of Protestants," wrote Chillingworth, "I do not understand the doctrines of Luther, or Calvin, or Melancthon, nor the Confession of Augsburg or Geneva, nor the Catechism of Hiedelberg, nor the Articles of the Church of England ; no, nor the harmony of all Protestant Confessions, but that wherein they all agree and which they subscribe with a greater harmony as the perfect rule of their faith and actions, that is the Bible." Perhaps the ground principle of one Reformation was never more admirably stated : the principle of our Reformation is an advance along the same line. The religion of Protestants, or let us say Christians, is not the Bible in all its parts, but first of all that portion which is its soul, by which the teaching of Prophets and Apostles must itself be judged,—the very words of Jesus.

As soon as any body of men band themselves together for a common object—whether it be making a railway or regenerating a world—they must come to an understanding, and promise loyalty. This is their covenant, which no man need accept unless he please, but which, after acceptance, he must keep. When Jesus founded that unique society which He called the Kingdom of God, and we

prefer to call the Church, it was necessary He should lay down its basis, and this is what He did in the Sermon on the Mount. For we ought not to think of that sermon as a mere detailed report of one of His numerous addresses, which often sprang from unexpected circumstances. It was not a defence against the Pharisee, like the 15th chapter of St. Luke, or an explanation to the disciples, like the 13th of St. Matthew. It was an elaborate and deliberate utterance, made by arrangement, and to a select audience. It was Christ's manifesto, and the constitution of Christianity. When Jesus opened His mouth, His new society was in the air. When He ceased, every one knew its nature, and also on what terms a man might belong to it. It would be very difficult to say which is the latest creed of Christianity; there is always some new one in formation, but there can be no question which is the oldest. Among all the creeds of Christendom the only one which has the authority of Christ Himself is the Sermon on the Mount. When one reads the Creed which was given by Jesus, and those which have been made by Christians, he cannot fail to detect an immense difference, and it does not matter whether he selects the Nicene Creed or the Westminster Confession. They all have a family likeness to each other, and a family unlikeness to the Sermon on the Mount. They deal with different subjects, they move in a different atmosphere. Were the Athanasian Creed and the Beatitudes printed in parallel columns, one would find it hard to believe that both documents were virtually intended to serve the same end, to be a basis of discipleship. It is not that they differ in details, one insisting on different points of one consistent covenant, but that they are constructed on different principles. When one asks, "What is a Christian?" the Creed and the Sermon not only do not give the same answer, but answers so contradictory that from the successive specifications he could create two types without

any more resemblance than a bird and a fish. We all must know many persons who would pass as good Christians by the Sermon, and be cast by the Creeds, and many to whom the Creeds are a broad way and the Sermon is a very strait gate. Since there is nothing we ought to be more anxious about than being true Christians, there is nothing we ought to think out more carefully than this startling variety.

What must strike every person about Jesus' sermon is that it is not metaphysical but ethical. What He lays stress upon are such points as these: the Fatherhood of God over the human family; His perpetual and beneficent providence for all His children; the excellence of simple trust in God over the earthly care of this world; the obligation of God's children to be like their Father in heaven; the paramount importance of true and holy motives; the worthlessness of a merely formal righteousness; the inestimable value of heart righteousness; forgiveness of sins dependent on our forgiving our neighbour; the fulfilling of the law of love, and the play of the tender and passive virtues. Upon the man who desired to be His disciple and a member of God's Kingdom were laid the conditions of a pure heart, of a forgiving spirit, of a helpful hand, of a heavenly purpose, of an unworldly mind. Christ did not ground this Christianity in thinking, nor in doing, but first of all in being. It consisted in a certain type of soul—a spiritual shape of the inner self. Was a man satisfied with this type, and would he aim at it in his own life? Would he put his name to the Sermon on the Mount, and place himself under Jesus' charge for its accomplishment? Then he was a Christian according to the conditions laid down by Jesus in the fresh daybreak of His religion.

When one turns to the Creeds, the situation has changed, and he finds himself in another world. They have nothing to do with character; they do not contain an idea of

character ; they do not ask pledges of character ; they have no place in their construction for character. From their first word to the last they are metaphysical, not ethical. They dwell on the relation of the three Persons in the Holy Trinity ; the Divine and human natures in the Person of Jesus ; His miraculous birth by the power of the Holy Ghost upon the Virgin Mary ; the connection between His sacrifice and the Divine law ; the nature of the penalty, and its reference to His Atonement ; the purposes of God regarding the salvation of individuals, and the collision between Free Will and Divine ; the means by which grace is conveyed to the soul ; the mysterious nature of the sacraments, and the intermediate state. From time to time those problems have been discussed, and the conclusions of the majority have been formed into dogmas which have been made the test of Christianity. If any one should decline assent to one or all of those propositions, as the case may be,—on the ground that he does not understand them, for instance,—and offers instead adherence to Jesus' Creed in the Sermon on the Mount, it would be thought to be beside the question ; just as if any one had declined obedience to Jesus' commandments, and offered instead acceptance of any theory of His Person, the Master would have refused His discipleship with grave emphasis.

It may, of course, be urged that Jesus said many things afterwards which must be added to the Sermon on the Mount, to form the complete basis of Christian discipleship, and that great discourse is sometimes belittled as an elementary utterance, to which comparatively slight importance should now be attached. Certainly Jesus did expound and amplify the principles of His first deliverance, but there is no evidence that he altered the constitution of His Kingdom either by imposing fresh conditions or omitting the old. Did He not teach on to the Cross that we stood to God as children to a Father, and must do His will ;

that for no sin there was or could be forgiveness till it was abandoned; that the state of the soul and not the mere outside life was everything; that the sacrifice of self, and not self-aggrandisement was His method of salvation; that love was life; and when He said, "Believe in Me; carry My Cross," was He not calling men to fulfil His Gospel? If one had come to Christ at Capernaum or Jerusalem, and said, "Master, there is nothing I so desire as to keep Thy sayings. Wilt Thou have me, weak and ignorant although I be, as Thy disciple?" can one imagine Christ then, or now, or at any time interposing with a series of doctrinal tests regarding either the being of God or the history of man? It is impossible because it would be incongruous. Indeed if Christ did revise and improve the conditions of discipleship, we should learn that from the last address in the Upper Room. But what was the obligation He laid then on the disciples' conscience, as with His dying breath? "This is My commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you." It is the Sermon on the Mount in brief.

No church since the early centuries has had the courage to formulate an ethical creed, for even those bodies of Christians who have no written theological creeds, yet have implicit affirmations or denials of doctrine as their basis. Imagine a body of Christians which should take their stand on the sermon of Jesus, and conceive their creed on His lines. Imagine how it would have read, "I believe in the Fatherhood of God; I believe in the words of Jesus; I believe in the clean heart; I believe in the service of love; I believe in the unworldly life; I believe in the Beatitudes; I promise to trust God and follow Christ, to forgive my enemies and to seek after the righteousness of God." Could any form of words be more elevated, more persuasive, more alluring? Do they not thrill the heart and strengthen the conscience? Liberty of thought is allowed; liberty of sinning is alone denied. Who would refuse to sign this creed?

They would come from the east, and the west, and the north, and the south to its call, and even they who hesitated to bind themselves to a crusade so arduous would love it, and long to be worthy. Does one say it is too ideal, too unpractical, too quixotic? That no church could stand and work on such a basis? For three too short years the Church of Christ had none else, and it was by holy living, and not by any metaphysical subtleties, the Church lived, and suffered, and confessed for the first three centuries of the Christian era.

JOHN WATSON.

RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

SERMONS.—Foremost among the sermon literature of the present season must certainly be placed the remarkably handsome volume of *The Anglican Pulpit Library*, Sexagesima to Good Friday (Hodder and Stoughton). The editor of this volume modestly conceals his name; but, whoever he is, he certainly knows a good sermon. In the present volume we not only meet the welcome names of well-known preachers, but are also introduced to new names which must inevitably become well known. Mr. Winnington Ingram may especially be mentioned as a preacher who cannot but make his mark. As a representative selection of the preaching of to-day this volume has a present and permanent value.

Messrs. Isbister & Co. have added to their "Gospel and the Age" series some new volumes. One of these is Dr. R. F. Horton's *The Teaching of Jesus*. This volume is less revolutionary but more original and generally attractive than its author seems to believe. In his preface he leads his readers to suppose that he has done little more than popularize Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus* and Beyschlag's *New Testament Theology*. These works have made a deep impression upon Dr. Horton, as they must indeed bring unusual stimulus and instruction to all inquiring minds. But when he is prompted by his admiration to affirm that "few, even among theologians and preachers," have before these writers made a study of the teaching of Jesus we must demur. He would have been

nearer the mark had he said that few have made a *systematic* grouping of the teaching of Jesus; and thus no doubt there has been a loss. But when one thinks of the libraries which have been written on the Parables, the Sermon on the Mount, the Eschatological Discourse, the Words of the Lord, it seems somewhat too sweeping to say that the teaching of Jesus has not attracted attention. There is however much to be gained by the systematizing of this teaching. But even this has already been vigorously attempted for more than a generation. Putting this aside, however, Dr. Horton has given us an excellent volume, animated by that freshness of enthusiasm, sincerity, and force which are inseparable from himself and from his utterances. He is most helpful precisely in those parts of his book where he is least indebted to Wendt and Beyschlag; and he is weakest where he should be strongest, in his discussion of Christ's teaching regarding His death. He neglects one or two passages bearing on this subject which to some theologians seem to carry us considerably farther than Dr. Horton goes. Also, is it not a little audacious to say that John misunderstood the words of Christ on two occasions? But we have no pleasure in finding fault with a volume which deserves a cordial welcome and can only do good.—Another volume of this series is *Temptation and Toil*, by W. Hay M. H. Aitken, M.A. It contains two series of addresses, the first at a recent mission, the second to working men at their dinner hour. Both are excellent. The first course is especially valuable as presenting with extraordinary impressiveness the human nature of Christ.—The editor has been fortunate in securing also a volume by Dr. J. H. Bernard, entitled, *From Faith to Faith*: The sermons it contains were preached for the most part before the University of Dublin; and while, as need scarcely be said, they have the scholarly air of university sermons, they are of general interest. Attention may especially be called to one on "Evolution and the Incarnation."—The same publishers issue a course of studies on the Sermon on the Mount by the Right Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, D.D., D.C.L., entitled, *The Great Charter of Christ*. The Bishop of Ripon has a singular faculty for bringing out the reasonableness of Christian claims. He has also an enviable gift of putting his meaning in a memorable form. Pleasanter sermons to listen to, there could not well be. Bishop Carpenter chose as the subject of his Visitation

Addresses in June last, *Some Thoughts on Christian Reunion*. These are now published by Messrs. Macmillan & Co. Many books on this theme have been issued during the last two years, but nothing so wise and catholic has appeared. Fundamental principles are here laid down which other writers, blinded by ecclesiastical prejudices, have entirely overlooked. It is the best contribution that has yet been made to the subject.—Messrs. Macmillan also issue *The Truth and the Witness*, by M. B. Williamson, M.A., in which the various witness to the claims of Christ is examined. An intelligent account is given of the Witness of the Father and of the Son, of Works, of the Prophets, of the Scriptures, of the Disciples, of the Holy Spirit. The volume contains much clear and exact thinking. With the same publishers Dr. Barry, formerly Bishop of Sydney, issues his Hulsean Lectures on *The Ecclesiastical Expansion of England in the Growth of the Anglican Communion*, an excellently written manual of English Church missions, containing a mass of facts and much wise observation regarding the adaptation of Christianity to races on lower and higher planes of civilization. Messrs. Macmillan also publish yet another volume by the late Dean Church, *Pascal and other Sermons*. The essay which gives its name to the volume is scarcely up to the level of Dean Church's work; but that on Butler is excellent, and the sermons are in some instances, though not in all, worthy of the most cultured preacher of the last generation. But why publish such unguarded utterances as occur in his sermon on "the Episcopate in Christian History"? "Only this [Episcopate] has been everywhere where Christianity has been; only this belongs peculiarly to Christianity as a whole."—Whoever has read previously published sermons by Prebendary Eyton will be sure to inquire for and to read his new volume, *The Temptation of Jesus and other Sermons* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.). The first five are on the Temptation. They display a close and keen consideration of the subject, a clear apprehension of the temptations of modern life, and a remarkable aptitude for touching the conscience without abandoning his fineness of method.—*The Seven Churches in Asia*, by Alexander Mackennal, D.D. (Elliot Stock), should be welcome both to lay and clerical readers. Each of the Asian churches is considered as a type of the religious life of to-day: thus Ephesus is the strenuous church, Thyatira the sentimental, Sardis the fickle,

and so forth. Dr. Mackennal always speaks to purpose, and in this volume the reader will be struck with the relevance and felicity with which he uses illustrations from poetry and history. — *Union with God* is the title of another series of addresses by J. Rendel Harris (Hodder and Stoughton). These addresses are characterized by the same spirituality and devoutness of tone as those already published. Here and there also occur little jets of incisive exegesis. They seem to be prompted mainly by the desire to deliver Christian people from the thralldom of what he calls "minimum Christianity." Hence he does not always escape the opposite snare of perfectionism. And to all who collide with the Westminster Confession of Faith the apologue of the locomotive and the cow may be commended.

The Religious Tract Society has published Mr. Williams' *Personal Reminiscences of Charles Haddon Spurgeon*, a volume which is full of the wit and wisdom of the great preacher and humorist. Mr. Williams enjoyed his friendship for many years, and faithfully represents him as he was in his rural rambles, in the pulpit, among his students, and as a friend. He also prints some of his letters and "sermon sayings." The volume is well illustrated, and in all respects desirable.

The *Sunday Magazine* for 1895 (Isbister & Co.) contains a serial story by Christabel R. Coleridge, and several shorter stories; several Biblical papers, among which are twelve by the Bishop of Ripon; talks with notables; historical, missionary, and natural history papers; Sunday evenings for the children, and poetry. The illustrations are excellent, and altogether it would be hard to find a better book for family use. The same firm issues the annual volume of *Good Words*, in which we have not only Crockett's "Men of the Moss-Hags," but one of Clark Russell's most exciting tales, "Heart of Oak." Other contributors are the Editor, Andrew Lang, Sir Robert Ball, Dr. Stalker, Sir Herbert Maxwell, Baring-Gould, and many more. Inside and out the volume is a most attractive one, and the reader will find something in it for every mood. The editor may be congratulated on maintaining year by year the character of a magazine which has seen so many contemporaries born and die.

Messrs. Macmillan & Co. send us the opening number of another year of *St. Nicholas*, which is as racy and as beautifully illustrated as ever. *The Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine* has attained

its twenty-fifth anniversary, and all intelligent persons who value wholesome and bright reading must wish it long life and unabated vigour. Messrs. Macmillan now publish the *Jewish Quarterly Review*. The appearance is attractive, and the articles will interest non-Jewish readers as well as those for whom they are primarily intended.

From the same publishers we have received two most acceptable reprints, both issued in the Eversley form; the one is the classic *Ecce Homo*, the other the late Dean Church's *Beginning of the Middle Ages*—two books whose value is likely to be appreciated for many years to come, and which it is a delight to read in the virtually perfect adaptation to hand and eye, which is associated with this beautiful series. Messrs. Macmillan & Co. also publish a second and cheaper edition of Mr. Illingworth's Bampton Lectures on *Personality Human and Divine*, one of the most original, satisfactory, and beautiful contributions to philosophical theology in this generation.

MARCUS DODS.

*REMINISCENCES OF THE LECTIONARY
COMMITTEE.*

THE private history of the work of the Committee, or, to speak more technically, of the sub-Committee of the Ritual Commission, to which was entrusted the drawing up of the present Lectionary of the Church of England, will probably not be devoid of interest to the readers of the EXPOSITOR. Though not a subject of a directly expository nature, it will still be found to involve, both in its description of the principles which the Revisers of the Old Lectionary kept steadily before them, and of the manner in which these principles were carried out, some passing elucidations of Holy Scripture. It will also certainly indicate what the Revisers considered to be the most profitable mode of reading publicly the Word of God with a view to personal and general edification.

It will be well to state at the very outset that the object of this paper is not to explain the details of the new Lectionary, but simply to give a brief account of the manner in which the Committee carried out the work entrusted to them, and of the general course of their procedure in reference to the three portions of that work—the revision of the Lessons chosen for Sundays, for Holy Days, and for daily reading throughout the year. There are two reasons for this limitation. In the first place, the New Table of Lessons was explained shortly after its authoritative publication in a small but carefully written volume by Prebendary Humphry, who acted throughout as the secretary of the Committee, and who kept the minute-book with that care and precision which marked every undertaking with

which my lamented friend was in any degree connected. As it is a quarter of a century since that useful explanation was written, it may be well now to mention that it appeared in 1871, and was published in Cambridge for Deighton, Bell & Company, and for Bell & Daldy, in London. Its object was to explain the reasons for the choice of the Lessons ultimately agreed upon; but I have found it also very useful in steadying a memory which is exercising itself in a long retrospect. As, however, I have already mentioned, the object of the useful manual and of these reminiscences is different, and the point of view of each hardly in any respect identical.

The second reason for the particular tenor of the present paper is of a melancholy nature. Finding myself, alas! the solitary survivor of the pleasant company with which I long and happily worked, I have for some time felt it desirable to leave behind some record of the *modus operandi* of the Committee that drew up our present Lectionary. It would seem to be the more necessary, as that which would, to a large degree, supersede this paper—the minute-book to which I have alluded—has been unhappily, and apparently irrecoverably, lost. So far as can be made out, the book, after the labours of the Committee came to a close, remained in the custody of our deeply interested and genial chairman, Bishop Wilberforce, then Bishop of Oxford. After his death a most careful search was set on foot by Prebendary Humphry and the active secretary of the parent Commission, Mr. Kemp, of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Every effort was made to find the small black leather quarto which contained our annals, but to this hour not a trace of it has been discovered. We suppose that it was either lost in the removal of Bishop Wilberforce from the See of Oxford to that of Winchester, or destroyed among papers supposed to be of no value after his sudden and lamented decease.

For these two reasons, then, this paper has been written in the form in which it now appears before the reader. It will, at any rate, supply some record of past labours, though necessarily an imperfect one, as resting partly on recollection, and partly on the scanty notices of a briefly-kept journal. It will also indicate in a general way the manner and circumstances in which an integral part of our Book of Common Prayer was reconstructed by those to whom the responsible work was committed by the members of the Ritual Commission.

To begin this narrative, I may remind the reader that the Royal Commission appointed for the consideration of the rubrics and directions of the Book of Common Prayer, including the Tables of Lessons and other preliminary matter, commenced its sittings on June 17th, 1867, and after 108 meetings (not including those of the Lectionary Committee), brought them to a close on June 28th, 1870.

The Lectionary Committee was appointed November 21st, 1867, and the following were chosen to serve on it out of the general body of the Commissioners:—Earl Beauchamp (6th Earl), Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce), Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Dean of Westminster (Stanley), Dean of Ely (Goodwin, afterwards Bishop of Carlisle), Dean of Lincoln (Jeremie), Canon Payne Smith (afterwards Dean of Canterbury), and the late Prebendary Humphry, Vicar of St. Martins-in-the-Fields. On the next meeting of the Commission (Nov. 27th) the Bishop of St. David's (Thirlwall) was added to our number. We were thus nine in all; and it may here be remarked that the greater part of these were steadily punctual in attendance, so that the quorum, so far as I can now remember, very rarely fell below the majority of the whole body. The fact was soon evident that we all became deeply interested in the work, and found it a welcome refreshment after the debates and discussions in the general body of the Commission. Our

meetings on several occasions were held immediately after the sitting of Commission, and the walk from the Jerusalem Chamber, where the Commissioners regularly sat, to the lodgings of Bishop Wilberforce at 26, Pall Mall, where our Lectionary meetings, by our friend's kindness, were regularly held, was the pleasant introduction to an hour and a half of welcome work in connection with God's Holy Word.

Before entering into details, it may be best to allude to the general principles which guided us in the prosecution of the work. These principles were not definitely formulated, but were the outcome of two or three preliminary conversations in which we carefully discussed, and ultimately came to a general agreement upon, what seemed to us to be the true nature of the work that was entrusted to us. It was not merely to revise in detail tables of lessons already in use, but to draw up tables suitable for the uses of our own times, whether by modification of existing selections, or by more complete and fundamental reconstruction. The one word that seemed best to define our general aim in the changes we made was *edification*; just as, in another and greater work, the revision of the Authorised Version—the one word *faithfulness* represented the dominant principle on which changes were introduced by the Revisers of the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures.

Resting on this broad principle of edifying, as far as the changes we made could ensure it, the future hearers of the Lessons that we were selecting, we soon came to the agreement of adopting shorter portions of Scripture, especially in the New Testament, than we found before us in the old Lectionary.

The maintenance of chronological sequence, especially in the Old Testament, as far as it could be arranged in the order of the Books from which the Lessons were taken, was

also a tacitly recognised principle. At the same time we were well aware that this principle could not be rigidly carried out, from the simple fact that the ecclesiastical year and the civil year had different starting-points, and that the prophecy of Isaiah, for example, could not be detached from the seasons of Advent and Christmas in which it was read and rightly read from the time of the First Prayer-Book onward.

Another principle which emerged from our preliminary considerations was that of finding a place for some portions at least of every Book of the Canonical Scriptures. In the Old Lectionary, as we may remember, the Books of Chronicles had been entirely passed over, though room had been found for Bel and the Dragon, and the History of Susanna, and an unduly large portion of the Apocrypha.

These were some of the leading principles which, though, as I have already mentioned, not definitely formulated, were not the less tacitly accepted and acted on throughout our Revision. They involve, it will be seen, designs not always in harmony with each other; as, for example, a shortening of Lessons on the one hand, and on the other a finding room for adequate portions of Books which had been exiled, or insufficiently made use of, as, for example, the prophecies of Ezekiel. This second matter, and, in the sequel, the possible want of room for the Lessons we wished to add, was always before us. What we mainly relied on, however, for supplying room, when we might hereafter need it, was the space occupied in the Old Lectionary by the 106 Lessons from the Apocrypha. Of this we early took notice as a space which might be profitably utilized in finding room for the introduction of new Lessons from the canonical Scriptures.

Some little interest may perhaps be felt in knowing what our *apparatus biblicus* was in the construction of the new Tables. So far as I remember, it was simple and slender.

A Bible, a Prayer-Book, and the best Paragraph Bible of the time (about which I was commissioned to make inquiry) made up our library. Our object was not antiquarian. We knew generally the nature of the Lectionary in the first Prayer-Book, and the changes made in the Prayer-Book of 1559, but into these details we rarely, if ever, entered. What we had to do was to revise what was before us in the Prayer-Book of 1662, and where necessary to reconstruct; and to this work we confined ourselves. We became, however, involved in the paragraph question in the New Testament, and especially in the Gospels, in which the chapter-system was no longer observed. We were thus obliged to take into cognisance what seemed to be the best modern arrangement, as well as that which was indicated in the Bibles which we had in our hands.

With this matter we were, of course, only concerned in fixing where the new Lessons were to terminate, when not terminating at the end of a chapter. With this detail of our work I do not remember that any fault was found in the countless criticisms that were lavished on our work when it was first made public. It might be of some interest to investigate where our division happens to differ from the paragraphs of the Revised Version, but with this I need not now concern myself. I have looked through St. Matthew's Gospel in which the chapter-system has been much broken up in the new Tables of the Daily Lessons, and I only observe two differences of opinion, viz., at chapter xvi. 24, and chapter xix. 27, in neither of which cases the Revised Version has any break of the continuity.

Turning our thoughts now to the work itself, and the order in which it was executed, we grievously need the guidance of the lost minute-book. So far as I can remember, and the few notes which I made at the time serve to guide me, we began with the Daily Lessons, after having fully talked out the principles to which I have referred, and

also having settled that some portion of the Apocrypha, especially of the so-called sapiential Books, should be included.

The work on the Old Testament went on comparatively easily. The Book of Numbers was slightly increased; seventeen Lessons from the second Book of Chronicles were inserted; the Lessons from Job were slightly reduced; those from Ezekiel were largely increased; and those from Isaiah slightly added to. The lessons from the Apocrypha were reduced by more than one-half, portions of the Book of Tobit being retained in the Report as presented to the Commission, but, as will be mentioned, struck out afterwards, so that ultimately the 106 Lessons from the Apocrypha in the old Tables of Lessons were reduced to 40 in the new Tables.

In the Lessons from the New Testament great changes were introduced. Instead of the New Testament (excluding the Revelation) being read through three times in the year, it was only read through twice in that time, and was so arranged that when the Gospels were read in the morning, the Acts and the Epistles were read in evensong, and *vice versâ*. The Book of the Revelation also, to the extent of twenty-two Lessons, found at last a place in the calendar in the closing days of the year.

For this last change I stand mainly responsible. I had brought forward the subject early in our preliminary discussions, but found then but little to encourage me. Feeling very deeply on the subject, I spoke earnestly from time to time with individual members of the Committee, and at last so far succeeded that, when it was found there was available space, it was agreed that we should provisionally go through the holy Book, and see if we could frame out of it Lessons which should stand that test of edification which, as I have already said, dominated all our proceedings. We commenced, and as we went on we all, I believe, alike felt

not only the feasibility, but the desirableness and even appropriateness, of thus closing the year with Lessons from this elevating portion of God's most Holy Word. Three chapters only—the 9th, 13th, and 17th—were omitted, on account of their mystery and the difficulties of interpretation which they involved: and so the Book of the Revelation of St. John the Divine was restored after a considerable lapse of time to a place in the Christian calendar. The place which the Book originally occupied in the readings of the early Church was the period between Easter and Whitsuntide; but as this period was already assigned to other portions of Holy Scripture in accordance with the chronological arrangement to which I have already alluded, we unanimously fixed upon the appropriate period which the Lessons from the Revelation now occupy in our calendar.

Our next work, so far as my memory serves me, and as my notes made at the time seem to substantiate, was the revision of the Table of Proper Lessons for Holy Days. This part of our work did not occupy a very large amount of our time. The old Lectionary was obviously defective. Some Holy Days, such as Ash-Wednesday and the Monday and Tuesday in Holy Week, had no special Lessons assigned to them. Others—such, for example, as the festivals of St. Andrew, St. Thomas, the Purification, and the Annunciation, for all of which it was obvious that appropriate Lessons could easily be chosen—were either left without second Lessons (as in the two former cases), when such could suitably be assigned, or had the first Lessons (as in the two latter cases) chosen from the Apocrypha, when the canonical Scriptures could appropriately be used. Every part of this section of the work assigned to us required careful revision, and has, I believe, been admitted to have suitably received it. The reader who may desire to enter into details will find, in the useful work of Prebendary

Humphry, to which I have already referred, the reasons given for the choice of the particular Lessons now assigned to the Holy Days of our Church.

The last part of our work, so far as I can recollect, and as memoranda made at the time seem clearly to indicate, was the important work of revising the proper Lessons for Sundays. I seem to remember that we kept this work to the end, that we might approach it after having acquired much useful experience. One or two important questions had to be settled at the outset. Were we to yield to the modern desire to cancel for public reading on Sundays all those Lessons which might be considered to contain what has been commonly called painful matter? For the most part we answered this question in the negative. We did, however, omit Genesis xxxiv. This question came up once in the New Testament, viz., in Romans i. It was proposed, I remember, that the Lesson should stop just before a certain verse, and that the following Lesson should begin at the verse after it. At first there was a little tendency to adopt the expedient; but some further consideration, to say nothing of the context, speedily disposed of the matter.

Another matter of importance was considered very carefully—the necessity of bringing before the larger Sunday congregations more of the canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament than was set forth in the old Table of the Proper Lessons for the Lord's Day. This we were enabled to carry out by two arrangements: first, by a reduction of the number of lessons from the Book of Proverbs, which, however edifying they might be to the careful *reader* of God's Holy Word, who could dwell upon what he was reading, were certainly less likely to be profitable to the general *hearer* than Lessons from other portions of Scripture in which there was more continuity of subject. Secondly, our purpose was greatly forwarded by having to draw up a table of alternative First Lessons for Evensong, this (if I remember rightly)

being an instruction given to us by the Commission at our appointment.

Having thus at our disposal space acquired by the reduction above mentioned, and as many as about fifty-eight additional Lessons to provide for, we were enabled to introduce into the Sunday calendar portions from Ruth, Chronicles, Nehemiah, Job, Ecclesiastes, Amos, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Malachi, and to add to the lessons from books which were already in the Sunday calendar. All this required much thought and care, and absorbed not a small amount of time. I find noted in my contemporary memoranda that this last portion of our responsible work was executed very slowly.

The exact number of the meetings of the Committee I am not able to state with precision. The number of my own attendances I find from my memoranda to have been about thirty. As I was very punctual in my attendance throughout the sittings of the Commission, and especially at those of the Lectionary Committee, I do not think the number of meetings could have exceeded thirty-two, if even they reached that number. The greater part of our work was done between February 10th, 1868, and July 20th in that year. There were also about ten or eleven sittings in the early part of 1869, and with these our work came to its close. On May 13th of that year our Report was laid on the table of the Commission.

Of the particular part taken in the work by my dear fellow-labourers I cannot trust a memory that is now looking backward very nearly a whole generation. But this I do well remember, that our meetings were marked from the beginning to the end by the most perfect harmony; that all took part in the work with a heart-interest that was particularly noticeable; that we had in Bishop Wilberforce a wise and genial chairman, and in Prebendary Humphry a most punctual and accurate secretary; that we owed

much to Dean Stanley in reference to the historical books ; that Bishop Thirlwall was a very helpful and watchful critic in our choice of Lessons from the Apocrypha ; and that the only layman among us, Earl Beauchamp, showed a knowledge and love of Holy Scripture that was not exceeded by the knowledge and love shown in our work by any of his clerical fellow-labourers.

What follows will be found more fully stated in the printed records of the Commission as drawn up by the accurate and indefatigable secretary of the Commission, Mr. W. F. Kemp, of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

The substance is as follows : The Report being now on the table of the Commission, formal notice was given that it would be taken into consideration on June 10th (1869). At that meeting very favourable comments were made on the Report viewed as a whole ; but, as might easily have been foreseen, the retention of Lessons from the Apocrypha was at once challenged ; and the more so, as a few Lessons from the Book of Tobit appeared in the first form of the Report. A division was taken on the general question of the retention of the Apocrypha, but only five votes were given for its expulsion, sixteen being given for its retention. The subject was then adjourned till the next day.

On June 11th the Apocrypha question was partially adjusted by the adoption of a note which now forms part of the directions in the Preface to the Prayer-Book relative to the reading of Holy Scripture, by which, in any case of real difficulty, the Ordinary may interpose. This, however, did not completely settle the question. The appointment of Lessons from the Book of Tobit was strongly objected to, and, after full discussion, cancelled, thirteen votes being given for the rejection of the Lessons out of that Book, and eleven for their retention. After some objections in detail, which ultimately were not pressed to a division, the Report went back to the Committee.

The Committee held another, and that their last, meeting on June 19th. In this meeting they removed the Lessons from Tobit, and made such adjustments as the removal rendered necessary. The revised Report was presented on June 24th, and on the same day the Report, as presented, was approved and adopted by thirteen votes, as against one dissentient voice.

A year then passed away. The Commission held its last, and 108th, meeting on June 28th, 1870. Its Report, including the Tables of Lessons, was presented to the Queen, and very shortly afterwards Parliamentary action was taken by the Lord Chancellor (Lord Hatherley), who introduced the Tables of Lessons Bill into the House of Lords. The second reading took place on July 7th, 1870. The Bill was criticised by Lord Shaftesbury, and strong exception was taken by him to the omission of Joshua x., which in the old Tables was the first lesson for the morning of the first Sunday after Trinity, and contained the account of the sun and moon standing still on Joshua's speaking to the Lord, and afterwards issuing the command (vers. 12-15). I replied to Lord Shaftesbury by showing the reasons why the chapter, which from the beginning to the end was a recital of slaughter and extermination, was not retained as a Sunday Lesson, though, in the early part (including the miracle), holding distinctly a place in the Daily Lessons. This answer was considered to be sufficient, and the Bill passed the second reading without a division. In the Committee-stage a change was made by Archbishop Thomson in the provision relating to the use of other Lessons in lieu of Lessons from the Apocrypha. This change was withdrawn on the third reading. The Bill then passed the House of Lords, and subsequently the House of Commons, and, after receiving the Royal assent, became law.

As may be remembered, much opposition was at first

manifested against the new Lectionary. Faults were considered to be patent in all parts; pamphlets were written against it; resolutions never to use it were freely announced in several quarters. In the end, however, the opposition died out, and the new Lectionary became silently accepted, and used throughout the Church.

There seem now many reasons for thinking that, in due time, it will be thus also with the Revision of the Authorised Version of the Scriptures.

C. J. GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

THE EARLY VISITS OF ST. PAUL TO JERUSALEM.

I SHALL hope to be forgiven if, in offering a few words of reply to my friend Prof. Ramsay's criticism in the last number of the *EXPOSITOR*, I say very little about that part of it which is personal to myself. If I were to go more fully into this, I should have to deduct much from my friend's praise, but I should also have to deduct something from his blame. I fear it is true that I had overlooked some points in his argument—not wholly, for I find most of them marked in my copy of his book, but at the time of writing my article. I did not intend this to be in any sense exhaustive, and I stated the case in the form in which it still held possession of my own mind. I shall do my best to repair omissions; and I hope that at least, after Prof. Ramsay's own clear and incisive restatement, the readers of the *EXPOSITOR* will have had the data for forming a judgment sufficiently set before them.

I think that in some ways my friend expects rather too much. It is true that I am one of those who have given in adhesion to his view about the Galatian Churches; that is, on a balance of the evidence, I believe it to be somewhat more probable than the view which is opposed to it; but I

should not as yet be prepared to treat it as quite axiomatic. There must be an intermediate stage after the first acceptance of a new view in which it lies in the mind (so to speak) still upon its trial and in process of adjustment to other data.¹ I cannot claim to have got beyond this point ; and I do not think that Prof. Ramsay, who has for some time been giving concentrated attention to the subject, should expect the rest of us to keep quite even pace with him. In the present instance, however, this backwardness is of less importance, because the particular argument affected by it does not seem to me to be valid.

I have no wish to deprecate reasonable criticism, but my friend will allow me to say that I do rather deprecate some parts of his recent article. At the present stage of the inquiry we are, as it seems to me, concerned mainly with premises and data. I should have thought that these were fit subjects for the "dry light" of judicial investigation. But my friend is like a hound who, when once he has got upon the scent, goes off at full cry. He hunts down the statements of his opponents into what seem to him to be their consequences ; and as these are nearly always either morally or intellectually discreditable they are held up to ignominy. It is not only I who have this fate, but Bishop Lightfoot, and, on certain hypotheses for which we are responsible, even St. Luke and St. Paul. I know that my friend does not think us quite so bad as would appear (p. 189). At the end of his paper he pronounces over me an absolution for which I am most sincerely grateful ; but if he would ask himself rather earlier whether his opponents (for the nonce) really meant to do or to countenance all these wicked and stupid things, I believe that he would lower his note, and

¹ Though complaining of me for not being at the level of his own latest arguments, Prof. Ramsay confronts me with quotations from a popular work which I wrote eighteen years ago, and have hardly looked into since. I should express myself now rather differently.

the process would be less harrowing. I would suggest, with all deference, that while we are still in the region of construing and comparing texts we can afford to keep our equanimity. We are as yet only sketching in the outlines of our picture in pencil: the colour can be put in later.

I take it that we are both, Professor Ramsay and I, not aiming simply to establish a thesis, but co-operating together in the attempt to find out the truth. I therefore gladly go over the ground again with my friend's renewed statement before me, and with the help of this I shall endeavour to revise my own.

There are two main questions on which it is necessary to make up our minds: (1) Is it possible to identify the visit of St. Paul to Jerusalem described in Galatians ii. 1-10 with that of Acts xi. 30, xii. 25? (2) If these two visits are not to be identified and Galatians ii. 1-10 corresponds rather to Acts xv. 3-29, can any adequate account be given of the silence of St. Paul in regard to the second visit of Acts xi. 30?

1. On the first point I took the broad ground that Galatians ii. 1-10 implied a more advanced stage of the controversy with the Judaists than could have been reached at the time of the second visit, *i.e.*, about the year 44 (46 Ramsay) and before St. Paul's Galatian journey.

In reply to this Prof. Ramsay quite rightly calls attention to the attack made on St. Peter by "them of the circumcision" for his dealings with Cornelius (Acts xi. 2), and he also lays stress on the extreme sensitiveness of the Jews on any point connected with the religious status of those who had not undergone circumcision. Along with this he notes a coincidence of language in the description of the situation in Acts xi. 3 and Galatians ii. 12. St. Peter was accused in both instances of "eating with Gentiles."

By all means let these arguments have their due weight. I think it is true that I stated the case on the other side

with rather too little qualification. But I am still some way from acknowledging that Prof. Ramsay has proved his case, and that the situation of Galatians ii. could really have been reached by the years 44-46. I go further, and it seems to me that the language of St. Paul in *Ep. Gal.* is satisfied by nothing short of the events of the first missionary journey.

Prof. Ramsay makes it clear in his book that down to the departure of St. Paul on this journey the Gentiles who had been admitted to the Church were all drawn from the class of proselytes—of the second class, if not of the first. Speaking of the case of Cornelius, he says: "But this step, though an important one, was only the first stage in a long advance that was still to be made. Cornelius was a proselyte; and Peter in his speech to the assembly in his house laid it down as a condition of reception into the Church that the non-Jew must approach by way of the synagogue (x. 35), and become 'one that fears God'" (*St. Paul*, p. 42 f.). Again: "The Church of Antioch . . . contained a number of Greeks,¹ who were in the position of 'God-fearing proselytes,' but had not conformed to the entire law; and the question was still unsettled, what was their status in the Church" (*ibid.*, p. 44). It is not until the first journey that St. Paul takes the next step forward, and offers the Gospel directly to Gentiles. At Salamis, in Cyprus, St. Paul "was appealing direct for the first time to the Græco-Roman world as himself a member of that world. This is put plainly in [Acts xiv. 27] as the great innovation and the great fact of the journey. As soon as Paul and Barnabas returned to Syrian Antioch they made a report to the assembled Church 'of all things that God had done with them, and how He had opened a door of faith

¹ This would be still clearer if the reading of Acts xi. 20 were, as I am inclined to think it should be, Ἑλληνιστὰς and not Ἑλληνας (see especially Hort, *Intro.*, ad loc., and *Judaistic Christianity*, p. 59 f.).

unto the Gentiles' " (*ibid.*, p. 85). Of the two stages into which the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles is divided, this is the second: "and the historian fixes the psychological moment [of the change] precisely at the point where the Apostles faced the Magian in the presence of the proconsul of Cyprus" (*ibid.*). This is brought out by Prof. Ramsay in a very striking way.

But then we have to ask ourselves, Which of these two stages is presupposed in Galatians ii. 1-10? I cannot for myself have any hesitation in replying, the same later stage, —the second. The turning point is already behind the Apostle and not before. When he speaks of himself as laying before the leaders of the Church the Gospel which he preached among the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 2, ὃ κηρύσσω, "what I am in the habit of preaching"), I can only understand this of Gentiles in the fullest sense of the word, and of a practice which the Apostle had begun and not was about to begin. A little lower down he tells his readers how the actual success of his preaching was accepted as proof of the genuineness of his commission: "When they saw that I had been intrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, even as Peter with the gospel of the circumcision (for He that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for me also unto the Gentiles); and when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, James, and Cephas and John, they who were reputed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision" (Gal. ii. 7-9). Surely this "gospel of the uncircumcision" is something more than occasional preaching to proselytes; and surely the acceptance of it is the ratification of a success already gained. It seems to me to point as clearly as anything could point to the events of the first journey, the founding of the Galatian Churches. As I said in my previous article, it corresponds exactly to

the "rehearsing of what God had done" through the instrumentality of the two Apostles among the Gentiles (Acts xv. 4, 12). The conclusive argument in the narrative is the same as that in the epistle; the promise of work still to do is based upon the retrospect of work done. And if words are to bear their natural construction, that retrospect can only, I think, be of the successes of the first mission.

On this ground I take my stand. If I am dislodged from it, then it will be time to consider Prof. Ramsay's highly ingenious combinations. But, as it is, I am stopped at the threshold.

Prof. Ramsay has, however, an argument on the other side which he appears to consider decisive. He thinks that if we adopt (as I do provisionally) his own South-Galatian theory and identify the Churches founded on the first missionary journey with the Galatians of the Epistle, it becomes an "argumentative absurdity" for St. Paul to refer at all to his third visit to Jerusalem, on the ground that he is proving the independence of his Gospel *as first preached* in Galatia, and this third visit did not occur until after that first preaching. "On the South-Galatian theory the third visit to Jerusalem was later than the conversion of the Galatians, and it would therefore be not merely unnecessary but unadvisable to speak of that visit when he was discussing the origin of, and authority for, his original message to the Galatians" (p. 176).

All depends on the validity of this last phrase. Is it only the authority of the *original* message to the Galatians that is in question? In assuming that it is I believe that Prof. Ramsay presses too rigorously the phrase used by St. Paul—not anywhere in the near context, but—in Galatians i. 10: "I make known to you, brethren, as touching the Gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man." No doubt St. Paul begins at the beginning; he begins by speaking of his gospel as he first obtained it and as he first

preached it. But his general argument has to do not merely with this initial step but with its authority in the abstract—its authority at the time at which he is writing, its authority at the moment when it was deserted by the Galatians. These later moments cannot, I think, be excluded; and in reference to them the experience of the third visit is as much in point as that of the second.

For these reasons—not to speak of others which he will find concisely stated in a source to which I will refer later—Prof. Ramsay has neither removed the stumbling-blocks which prevent me from accepting his identification of the visit of Galatians ii. 1–10 with the second visit of the Acts, nor overborne the difficulties in the way of this view by the statement of others still greater.

2. But he will say, “If the visit of Galatians ii. is the third visit of the Acts, then the second visit mentioned in that work must be passed over by St. Paul without mention—which is incredible.” There is, I am inclined to think a better case to be made out for this proposition than for the other. It does not, however, in my opinion amount to anything decisive, and the *ἀπορίαι* raised in connexion with it seem to me to arise mainly from our want of knowledge. I took my stand here on the negative ground that whereas St. Paul’s purpose in *Ep. Gal.* required him to mention—not all his visits to Jerusalem but—all the occasions on which he had had any substantial intercourse with the Judæan Apostles, there was nothing in the Acts to show that on his second visit he had such intercourse. In the two verses which alone are devoted to this visit (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25) there is no allusion whatever to the Apostles. It is natural to ask, Why is this? I offered as a possible explanation one put forward by Bishop Lightfoot, by myself years ago, and probably by others—I have not looked up the history of it—that the Apostles may have been absent from Jerusalem owing to the persecution of Herod Agrippa

I., the account of which falls in the Acts just in the verses which intervene between that which describes the arrival of the mission and that which describes its departure. But this, no doubt, is pure conjecture. It is not conjecture to which I attach any importance. The most I would say for it is that there are one or two indications (the position of the account of the persecution in the Acts, the silence as to any contact of Paul and Barnabas with the Apostles, the traces of secrecy in the description of the meeting in the house of Mary, Acts xii. 12-17) which seem to point in that direction. So it still seems to me; the insufficiency of the data prevent me from saying more. I sit loosely to this hypothesis, as I do to all hypotheses which have so little direct evidence to commend them. The last thing that I would do would be to pledge myself to a precise reconstruction of details.

Here Prof. Ramsay strikes in. He has his own theory clear and sharply defined as usual. He will not allow it to be supposed that the mission of Paul and Barnabas was brief and hurried. Stress is laid on the accomplishment of a *διακονία*; and *διακονία* in the Acts means a prolonged and carefully conducted personal ministration. The gathering in the house of Mary was not a gathering of the whole Church. There is nothing to show that the Apostles were in hiding (Acts xii. 17 does not prove this). The persecution was not wide-spread or severe. To suppose that the Apostles fled from it would be a disgrace to them. On the other hand, the stay of Paul and Barnabas probably lasted or some time; and into that time may be packed the events of Galatians ii. 1-10.

There is much in this position which I should not care to contest. I never pretended—it would be wrong to pretend—that there is proof demonstrative of the flight and hiding of the Apostles. All I would say is that Prof. Ramsay's arguments do not seem to me decidedly to disprove

it. I think that he lays too much stress on St. Luke's use of *διακονία*. In the two Lucan writings together the word occurs in all but nine times. This is not enough to sustain a negative induction. Besides, there is a parallel in Romans xv. 31 so exact as, it would seem, quite to justify the opinion of those who would take it of a short visit. The Apostle there prays that on his approaching journey (A.D. 58) he may be delivered from his unbelieving countrymen in Judæa, *καὶ ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ εὐπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἀγίοις γένηται*. The ministration in question is the presenting of the sums collected in Macedonia and Greece for the poor of the Mother Church, so that the word is in a sense rightly glossed by the Western reading *δωροφορία*.

An argument to which I quite assent is that the meeting in the house of Mary (Acts xii. 12) is a private meeting for prayer, not a public assembly of the whole Church. I never thought of maintaining the contrary; and I have never to my knowledge spoken of St. Luke as a "rough narrator." But though a private meeting, the house in which it was held would seem to have been an important Christian centre, both from what we know of the position of St. Mark, the son of its owner, and also from the fact that St. Peter, on his release, at once makes his way there. This may suggest that there was some significance in the absence of St. James, and in St. Peter's sending a message and not proposing to go to him. But these are of course mere trifles, and very far from stringent proof that the leaders of the Church were in hiding. The most I should say would be that they may have been.

As to the morality of retiring before persecution it is hardly worth while to argue. No doubt there were unreasonable ways of doing this as well as reasonable; but to suppose that the Apostles (if they withdrew) withdrew from cowardice would be most gratuitous. The early Church

had a deliberate policy in such matters which history has approved, and not condemned. Its leaders did not court martyrdom, though they met it cheerfully when it came. The instances of Polycarp, Cyprian, and Dionysius of Alexandria, will occur to every one.

I might go on in this strain for some time, partly accepting and partly rebutting Prof. Ramsay's arguments; but I should take up more space than either the editor or the readers of the *EXPOSITOR* would care to give me. The result would, I freely admit, be inconclusive; just as I believe that Prof. Ramsay's case on the other side is inconclusive against me. The building up of imaginary situations where the data are so slight seems to me not very profitable. The facts may have been so, but they may have been quite different. A grain of positive evidence would outweigh much speculation. But the grain is wanting.

What I do contend for is only that we have no sufficient reason either (1) to throw over the definite statements which St. Luke makes as unhistorical,¹ or (2) to desert the preponderating indications that the visit which St. Paul has in his mind in Galatians ii. 1-10 is the third and not the second.

In conclusion I would venture to suggest to my friend and to others who may care to pursue the subject further, that they would find it worth while to consult the little commentary on Galatians by Dr. James Drummond, principal of Manchester College: the publishers are The Sunday School Association (Unitarian), Essex Hall, Essex Street, Strand, W.C. The preface is dated December, 1892; so that it was given to the world before the South-Galatian theory had been stated with so much force in Prof. Ramsay's *Church in the Roman Empire* (1893). It

¹ Dr. Drummond adopts this alternative as to the visit of Acts xi. 30, and I should not refuse to do so if the arguments for it were stronger.

therefore gives what is substantially the old view in regard to the Epistle; but it gives this with conspicuous clearness, independence, and impartiality. The author is at least removed from the imputation, which neither Bishop Lightfoot nor I have escaped, of apologetic harmonizing; though, speaking for myself, my conscience is clear of having given to the sacred writers any different measure from that which I should have given them if they had been profane.

I think that I have said enough; and I shall leave it to Prof. Ramsay, if he wishes it, to have the last word.

W. SANDAY.

THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION :

ITS BEARING ON THE TEXT AND INTERPRETATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.¹

I.

THE Septuagint Version presents a vast field of varied interest to students of the Old Testament, of the New Testament, and of Church History. Much labour has been spent upon it; but much more must be spent before we can hope to solve many of the problems connected with it, and utilise it to the full for the purposes of Biblical criticism and interpretation. The Manual Edition of the Cambridge Press, edited by Dr. Swete with a painstaking care and laborious accuracy which leave nothing to be desired, has at length placed in the hands of students the text of the Vatican MS. so far as it is extant, together with the various readings of all the important uncial MSS. : and the same Press now has in preparation the larger edition, for which the Manual Edition was meant to be preparatory. This edition will reproduce the text printed in the Manual Edition, with as full a critical apparatus as can be con-

¹ A paper read at Sion College, December 17, 1895,

tained in a work of reasonable size. It will include (1) the readings of all extant Greek uncial MSS. and fragments; (2) the readings of a certain number of cursive MSS., selected after careful investigation with the view of representing the different types of text; (3) the evidence of the Versions made from the LXX.—the Old Latin, Egyptian, Syro-hexaplar, and Armenian; (4) the evidence of the quotations in Philo, Josephus, and the more important Christian Fathers.

The Oxford Press, it will be remembered, has contributed a worthy share to the study of the LXX. by its publication of Field's splendid edition of Origen's Hexapla; and by the new edition of Tromm's Concordance commenced under the able superintendence of Dr. Hatch, and carried on under the equally skilful care of Mr. Redpath.

One indispensable work urgently needs to be done, and there is some hope that this too may shortly be undertaken: the preparation of a Lexicon to supersede the works of Biel and Schleusner, which, useful as they are, fall far below the requirements of modern scholarship.

II.

The origin of the LXX. is shrouded in obscurity. We have, indeed, in the famous Letter of Aristeas, a circumstantial account of the origin of the translation of the Pentateuch. This letter, which purports to have been written by Aristeas, an official of high position in the court of King Ptolemy II. (Philadelphus) (B.C. 283-247), to his brother Philocrates, relates that the king was urged by his librarian, Demetrius of Phalerum, to procure a translation of the laws of the Jews, to be deposited in the famous library at Alexandria. Accordingly the king wrote a letter to the High Priest Eleazar, who sent him from Jerusalem a magnificent copy of the law, written in letters of gold, on parchment of marvellous fineness, together with seventy-

two able scholars, six out of each tribe. The work was completed in seventy-two days, and the translators were sent back to Jerusalem loaded with royal bounties.

The details of the story, which received still further embellishment and amplification at the hands of later writers, are undoubtedly fictitious. But the letter of Aristeas is assigned by good authorities to a date not later than B.C. 200,¹ and it may rest on some foundation of fact. It is possible that the translation owed its origin to the literary enthusiasm of Hellenistic culture, though it is equally possible that it was called forth in a natural way by the religious needs of the Jews of the Dispersion.² We may, however, safely conclude that the Pentateuch was translated (1) *at Alexandria*, (2) *in the third century B.C.* The Pentateuch, I say, for it is certain from internal evidence that the LXX. is not homogeneous. We have to deal in it with the work of different authors, and of different times. When the prophets and the Hagiographa were translated, we do not know exactly; but they were in existence in B.C. 132, when the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach came into Egypt. In his prologue to his translation of his grandfather's work he excuses the defects of his translation in the following words:

“Things originally spoken in Hebrew have not the same force in them, when they are translated into another tongue; and not only these, but the law itself, and the prophecies, and the rest of the books, have no small difference, when they are spoken in their original language.”

Evidently he was acquainted with a Greek translation of the Prophets and the Hagiographa, and it will be noticed that he already uses the title which came to be the common Hebrew title for the Old Testament in its threefold classification, *Law, Prophets, and Writings*.³

¹ Schürer's *History of the Jewish People*, § 33 (E.T., ii. iii. 309), which see for fuller details in regard to the letter.

² Schürer, § 33 (E.T., ii. iii. 161).

³ Cp. Luke xxiv. 44.

Some further evidence as to the date of the translation may be obtained from the use of the LXX. by Hellenistic writers.¹ Demetrius (c. B.C. 200) made use of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch. Eupolemus (B.C. 160-150) was acquainted with the translation of Chronicles. Aristæas (not to be confounded with the author of the Letter), who lived at the latest in the first half of the first century B.C., made use of that of Job.

The date of the Septuagint Version of the Prophets and Hagiographa has an important bearing upon some modern theories as to the date of the final redaction of some of the books of the Old Testament. Duhm, for example, holds that the Book of Isaiah received considerable additions in the Maccabæan period. To this period he assigns (1) chap. xxxiii., "a prophetic poem, probably from the year B.C. 162; (2) chaps. xxiv.-xxvii. (exclusive of the later interpolations), an apocalypse, probably from the year 128 B.C.; (3) the lamentation over Moab, chaps. xv. 1-9a and xvi. 7-11; (4) the apocalyptic poem upon Edom and upon the future of Zion, chaps. xxxiv., xxxv."; and it was not, he thinks, till the first decades of the first century B.C. that the scribes finally united the various elements of the book in their present form.²

Some critics have referred the whole of the last three Books of the Psalter, as well as many Psalms in the earlier books, to the Maccabæan period, and would bring down the completion of the collection to the reign of John Hyrcanus (B.C. 135-107) or Alexander Jannæus (B.C. 105-79).

Now while we cannot dogmatically affirm either (1) that all the Canonical Books of the Old Testament were already included among those of which the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus speaks, or (2) that the books included had already reached their present form, there is at any rate a

¹ Schürer, § 33 (E.T., ii. iii. pp. 162, 163, 200-208).

² Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaja*, 1892, pp. xx., xxi.

very strong presumption that both the Book of Isaiah and the Psalter were included, and were included in their present form. For, to quote the late Prof. Robertson Smith's words, "the Greek Psalter, though it adds one apocryphal psalm at the end, is essentially the same as the Hebrew; there is nothing to suggest that the Greek was first translated from a less complete Psalter and afterwards extended to agree with the received Hebrew. It is therefore reasonable to hold that the Hebrew Psalter was completed and recognised as an authoritative collection long enough before 130 B.C., to allow of its passing to the Hellenistic Jews of Alexandria."¹ The same argument applies still more strongly to Isaiah, for in all probability the canon of the Prophets was completed before the canon of the Hagiographa; and even in regard to the Psalter it seems to me that Prof. Sanday is justified in doubting the existence of Maccabæan Psalms on the ground that "the number of steps implied between the Greek version of the Psalter and the original composition of the Hebrew Psalms is so great as to make it difficult to get them all into the interval between its date and even the earliest part of the Maccabæan period. "If there are Maccabæan Psalms, they slipped in as part of a collection which already had a high degree of sanction. As entirely new compositions, they could hardly have done so."²

III.

On the character of the Septuagint translation I need

¹ *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, ed. 2, p. 201. Similarly Baethgen, *Die Psalmen* (1892), p. xxx., "I consider it certain that the grandson of the author [of Ecclesiasticus] had the complete Greek translation before him."

² *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 257, 270. Prof. Robertson Smith, however (*Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, pp. 210, 211), held that the fifth Book of the Psalter contains Maccabæan Psalms, and that the final redaction of the Psalter may have taken place under Simon (c. 142 B.C.). But would ten years be a sufficient interval to allow for the completion and acceptance of the Greek Psalter?

say but little. It varies greatly in different books. The Pentateuch is the best part of the historical books; the Psalter is a fair translation; Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, and Job have fared ill indeed.¹ Sometimes the translation is free, sometimes slavishly literal. But the Greek is for the most part of the roughest description, bristling with Hebraisms, with uncouth words and strange constructions, which must have sounded hopelessly barbarous to those who were familiar with classical Greek. "Quite a new language," says Schürer justly (p. 163), "swarming with such strong Hebraisms that a Greek could not understand it, is here created. Not to mention the imitation of Hebrew constructions, many Greek words, which correspond to one meaning of a Hebrew word, are without further ceremony made equivalent to the whole extent of the meanings comprised in the Hebrew word, and thus significations are forced upon words which they do not at all possess in Greek (*e.g.* the words *ῥεῖα*, *εἰρήνη*, and many others)." The translation often misses the sense of the original. It is often patently absurd. It is very easy to pour ridicule upon it, and to say that it is neither Greek nor Hebrew. It was the work of pioneers, and necessarily had the defects of such work. But it formed an indispensable link of connexion between the Old Testament and the New Testament. It wedded the Greek language to Hebrew thought, and enlisted the noblest and most exact instrument of human utterance in the service of Divine truth. The importance of the study of the LXX. for the interpretation of the New Testament can scarcely be exaggerated.

IV.

But I must not linger any longer upon this topic. The two points to which I desire particularly to call attention

¹ "Nactus est Isaias interpretem sese indignum," observes Zwingli. Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments*, § 41, p. 123.

are (i.) the bearing of the LXX. on the text of the Old Testament; (ii.) the use of the LXX. in the Christian Church; and from these points I shall venture to draw certain inferences in which you may or may not follow me, but which seem to me to have an important bearing upon questions which are perplexing the minds of many at the present time.

(i.) Under the first head there are two points to be noticed: (1) the value of the LXX. for the correction of the Massoretic Text; (2) the evidence which it presents that some at least of the books of the Old Testament were at one time in circulation in what may be called different recensions.

1. I doubt whether in England we have altogether shaken off that superstitious reverence for the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament which reached its climax in the seventeenth century, when the *Formula consensus Ecclesiae Helveticae* (1676) pronounced in favour of the absolute authority, nay, inspiration, of the very vowel-points of the Hebrew text, and condemned the opinion of those who presumed to emend it from the LXX. and other Versions, or even by conjectural alterations.¹ There is still in some quarters a lingering idea that the practical unanimity of Hebrew MSS. is due to the scrupulous care with which they were preserved from the very first.

But when we come to examine the text itself, it is beyond question that, partly by intention, partly by accident, numerous alterations and errors have found their way into it.

(a) *Intentional alterations* were sometimes made. It is indeed very doubtful whether the wholesale "overworking" of the text by the *Sōphērīm* or Scribes, which some modern

¹ Buhl, §§ 78, 89, pp. 211, 237. Cp. Dorner, *Hist. of Prot. Theology* (E.T. ii. 30.

critics postulate, ever took place;¹ and there is certainly no sufficient ground for the charge brought against the Jews by some of the Fathers, *e.g.* Justin, of wilful depravation of the text in an anti-Christian interest.² But examples of intentional change are found in the substitution of *Manasseh* for *Moses* in Judges xviii. 30, to avoid the supposed disgrace reflected upon Moses by the apostasy of his descendant; and in the change of names compounded with *Baal*—*Esh-baal* to *Ish-bosheth*, *Beeliada* to *Eliada*—to avoid pronouncing the name *Baal*, or in the deletion of the name altogether, as in 2 Samuel iv. 2.

(b) *Accidental errors* due to the carelessness of transcribers are however numerous and serious. The proof of this assertion lies in the following facts:—

(1) There are many passages in which the text as it stands cannot be translated without doing violence to the laws of grammar, or offends against the rules of metre or parallelism or alphabetic structure, or is irreconcilable with the context, or cannot be harmonized with other passages.

(2) The nature of the variations in parallel passages is such as to make it clear that they are largely due to accidental corruption, though in part also to intentional change.

(3) The Ancient Versions, in particular the LXX., represent various readings, which in many cases bear a strong internal stamp of probability, and remove or diminish the difficulties of the Hebrew text.

It is in fact abundantly clear that the same sources of error, which we can see in operation in the MSS. of the New Testament, operated equally, or to an even greater

¹ Cf. Prof. A. B. Davidson's excellent remarks on Duhm's *Isaiah* in the *Critical Review*, vol. iii., p. 15.

² Yet Lagarde thought that the chronology of the patriarchal period had been tampered with in the Massoretic Text in order to refute the calculation derived from the LXX. that the Messiah appeared A.M. 5500 (Buhl, § 97, p. 253).

extent, in the transmission of the text of the Old Testament. Similar letters were confused,¹ a fertile source of corruption in an alphabet like the Hebrew alphabet, whether in its older or in its later form; similar groups of letters were omitted or repeated;² whole clauses were omitted because the scribe's eye lighted on the wrong catch-word, as he looked back from his MS. to the copy before him;³ words of similar sound were confused; words were wrongly divided;⁴ letters were transposed;⁵ abbreviations were misunderstood; marginal glosses were incorporated in the text, and omissions which had been supplied in the margin were introduced into the text at the wrong point.⁶ Over and above the causes which have operated in the MSS. of the New Testament, are causes of corruption peculiar to the Old Testament, in particular the transition from the archaic to the square characters, and the original absence of vowels and to a great extent even of vowel letters from Hebrew writing.

V.

In view of these facts it is not only a right but a duty to appeal to the Versions, especially the LXX., for the correction of the Massoretic Text. But we must go further. I digress for a moment to express my conviction that *Con-*

¹ Thus Gen. x. 3, 4, *Riphath, Dodanim*; but 1 Chr. i. 6, 7, *Diphath, Rodanim*; D (ד) and R (ר) being almost exactly alike. 2 Sam. xxiii. 27, *Mebunnai* (מבנאי) is an error for *Sibbechai* (סבכאי) of 1 Chr. xi. 29. "Yea, he was seen (וירא) upon the wings of the wind" (2 Sam. xxii. 11) is a mistake for "Yea, he swooped (סרסר)", as in Ps. xviii. 11.

² As in 2 Sam. vi. 3, 4; Hos. iv. 18.

³ Thus the LXX. inserts a group of eleven cities between v. 59 and v. 60 of Josh. xv., which has fallen out of the Hebrew text. Doubtless the LXX. preserves the true text, otherwise an important district of Judah, including Bethlehem and Tekoa, would be unrepresented.

⁴ See Gex. xlix. 19, 20; Ps. xlii. 6, 7; Jer. xxiii. 33. See below.

⁵ Ps. lxxii. 5. See below.

⁶ In 2 Sam. xix. 10, 11 (Heb. 11, 12), the clause "seeing the word of all Israel is come to the king" is misplaced. The LXX. has it where it is needed, at the end of v. 10 (11). So probably Isa. xxxviii. 21, 22, which cannot be translated where it stands without violence to grammar.

jectural Emendation has a legitimate place in the textual criticism of the Old Testament which it has not in that of the New Testament, where the evidence for the text is of a wholly different quality. I grant that very few of the multitude of conjectural emendations carry conviction. The majority of them seem to reflect the critic's ingenuity rather than the original text. But a few reach a very high degree of probability. Thus, for example, in Numbers xxiii. 3, Kuenen's וילך לכשפיו, "and he went to his enchantments," is a brilliant suggestion in place of וילך שפי, "and he went to a bare height." In Psalm xxii. 29 (Heb. 30) אֵף לוֹ, "Surely Him shall all earth's fat ones worship," for אכלוּ ו' ("eat and"), is commended by the sense and the parallelism. In Psalm lvi. 7 (Heb. 8), על און פלט למו has been the despair of commentators. The change of a single letter gives the reading פלס, "Weigh unto them (*i.e.* requite them) according to their iniquity." In Psalm xciii. 4 the emendation—

מקולות מים רבים
אדיר ממשברי ים
אדיר במרום יהוה

removes a grammatical anomaly, and restores the metrical rhythm (cp. *vv.* 1, 3):

"Above the thundering of many waters,
Majestic above the breakers of the sea,
Majestic on high is Jehovah."

In all these cases we can see how known causes of corruption would have operated; the omission of one of two pairs of the same letters, לָכ; the confusion of similar letters, ס and ט; the wrong conjunction of words and omission of one of two identical letters; the wrong division of words prompted by the fact that the phrase מים אדירים occurs elsewhere. In each case an anomalous phrase or construction is removed, or the sense or the rhythm improved.

VI.

But we tread on surer ground when we can appeal to the external evidence of the Versions for the correction of the Massoretic Text. Something may be gleaned from the later Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion; from the Targums; from the Syriac; and from the Vulgate. But the LXX. is our one authority which goes back into the period before the Christian era, and it is from the LXX. that we gain most help. Of course it does not necessarily follow that the LXX. is at once to be preferred to the Massoretic Text when it gives a different reading, even though it is practically certain that it represents a Hebrew text which lay before the translators. The relative value of the two readings must be carefully weighed; and obviously very great caution is needed in the use of a Version for purposes of textual criticism.¹

(a) The general character of the Version must be studied, and in dealing with the LXX. we have to remember, as I have stated already, that the LXX. is not a homogeneous work, but differs very considerably in its character in different books, if not in parts of books. Many variations, which at first sight seem to present genuine various readings, may be due simply to difference of idiom. Greek and English, for example, must supply many words which Hebrew leaves to be understood. A translator is constantly tempted to set the seemingly crooked straight, and to make rough places plain.

Many variations are due to the paraphrastic habit of the translator, who did not think himself bound to produce a mere word-for-word version.

Some variations may be due to the theological tendencies of the time, for Ancient Versions were liable (indeed what Version is not?) to reflect the ideas of the time and

¹ Cp. Driver, *Samuel*, pp. xxxix, ff.

to partake of the nature of a commentary.¹ The LXX., for example, avoids the bold anthropomorphisms and forcible naïvetés of the original text. Thus it substitutes "The Lord breaketh the battles" for "Jehovah is a man of war," in Exodus xv. 3; and "They saw the place where the God of Israel stood," for "They saw the God of Israel," in Exodus xxiv. 10. It introduces, though comparatively seldom, references to recent or contemporary circumstances, as, for example, in Isaiah ix. 11, "He shall scatter His enemies, Syria from the east, and the Greeks from the west." It interprets figurative expressions, putting "great and small," for "palm branch and rush," in Isaiah ix. 13. It removes harshnesses of expression and style.

(b) It must be remembered that numerous corruptions have crept into the Greek text. The same sources of error which were operative in the Massoretic Text and in the text of the New Testament have been operative here; and not these only, but others, for a translation is liable to perpetual corrections, made first in the margin and then brought into the text, so that we find in the LXX. multitudes of duplicate renderings. An instance or two of obvious textual corruptions may be given here. In Psalm xlvii. (xlvi.) 10, ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου is a transcriber's error for ναοῦ. In Psalm lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 36, ἡγάπησαν is a mistake for ἡπάτησαν. In Psalm lxxxvi. (lxxxvii.) 5, the really beautiful reading Μητέρα Σειών, ἐρεῖ ἄνθρωπος ("Mother Sion, shall a man say") is, as the Vulg. *Numquid* shows, merely a graphical error for μήτι. So far in fact has the corruption of the Greek MSS. gone that in some cases the true reading has disappeared from all our extant MSS. As Mr. Burkitt has shown (*Tyconius*, p. cxvii.), "there are renderings found in the old Latin representing Greek readings which have

¹ See Buhl, § 41, p. 121; König's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, § 26, 6; Farrar's *History of Interpretation*, pp. 119 ff.

disappeared from every known Greek MS., but which by comparison with the Hebrew, are shown to preserve the genuine text of the LXX., from which the readings of our present Greek MSS. are corruptions."

One famous reading deserves a passing mention as being beyond doubt a Christian interpolation. The Old Latin Version of Psalm xciv. (xcvi.) 10, reads "Dominus regnavit a ligno," which is quoted by many of the Latin Fathers from Tertullian onwards, as a prophecy of Christ's triumph through death. Justin Martyr, who found the words ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου in his text, treats the psalm as a prophecy of Christ's reign after His crucifixion (*Apol.*, i. 41), and in his *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew* (c. 73) he roundly charges the Jews with having falsified the text by erasing the words from the Hebrew. The charge, it need hardly be said, is groundless. The words do not appear in any good Greek MSS.; in fact, they are only found in the Græco-Latin Psalterium Veronense, which has *apo xylu*, and cod. 156, which has the barbarism ἀπὸ τῶ ξύλω, both of which may have been influenced by the old Latin.

If, however, due caution is observed, the LXX. is a valuable aid for the correction of the Massoretic Text. I take a few instances almost at random.

In 2 Samuel xxiv. 6, ארץ תחתים חרשי is an old puzzle. No "land of Tahtim Hodshi" is known. But Lucian's text of the LXX. gives εἰς γῆν Χεττιεῖμ Καδῆς = ארץ ההתים קרשה, "to the land of the Hittites, towards Kadesh," the capital of the Hittite empire situated on the Orontes, which lay on the north border of Israel, and would be mentioned as naturally in defining the journey of the enumerators as Tyre and Zidon in *v.* 7. In 2 Kings xv. 10, for the unintelligible קבל עם, "before the people," Lucian's recension gives ἐν Ἰεβλαάμ = ביבלעם, "in Ibleam"; cp. 2 Kings ix. 27.

In Psalm xxii. 16 (17) even the A.V. deserts the Masso-

retic Text, which reads, *like a lion my hands and my feet*, in favour of the reading represented by the LXX. (*ὥσπερ*), and Syr., and to some extent supported by Aquila and Jerome, who attest a verb (*vinxerunt*). The original reading would appear to have been a verb, כָּאֲרִי, *they pierced*, corrupted into כֶּאֱרִי, which came to be read כָּאֲרִי, *like a lion*. In Psalm xxxvii. 28 the Massoretic Text interrupts the alphabetic structure of the psalm. The Vatican and Sinaitic texts of the LXX. are corrupt, but the other MSS. and the Vulg. point to an original עוֹלִים לְעוֹלָם נִשְׁמְדוּ, *the unrighteous are destroyed for ever*. This reading gives the proper acrostic letter, restores the line to its right length, and improves the parallelism; while the couplet then forms the antithesis to v. 29. The process of corruption is easily explicable upon well-known principles. עוֹלָם (written thus defectively) was omitted on account of its similarity to לְעוֹלָם. Then the change of נִשְׁמְדוּ (*destroyed*) to נִשְׁמְרוּ (*preserved*) followed as a matter of course, because the only possible subject to the verb was חֲסִידָיו (*his beloved*) in the preceding line.

In Psalm xlii. 5 (6) we have an example of error arising from the wrong division of words, combined with the omission of one of two similar words. The LXX. and Syriac suggest that we should read the refrain as in v. 11 (12) and xliii. 5, יְשׁוּעָת פָּנִי וָאֱלֹהִי, "who is the help of my countenance and my God"; and at the same time *O my God* should in all probability be retained at the beginning of the next verse. In Psalm xlix. 11 (12) the Massoretic Text reads:

"Their inward thought (קִרְבָּם) [is that] their houses [shall continue] for ever,
And their dwelling places to all generations;
They call the lands after their own names."

But the meaning attached to קִרְבָּם is very precarious; the LXX. has οἱ τὰφοι αὐτῶν, evidently representing קִבְרָם

(קִבְרִים or קִבְרָם) ; and as it is supported by the Syr. and Targ., it is doubtless right, and the verse should run somewhat as follows :

“ Graves are their houses for ever,
The dwelling places for all generations
Of those who called lands after their own names.”

Psalm lxxix. 26 (27) gives another example :—

“ For they persecute Him whom Thou hast smitten,
And talk of the grief of Thy wounded ones.”

The expression is a questionable one ; and how much more forcible is the reading suggested by the LXX. and Syr. :

“ *They add to the grief of Thy wounded ones.*”

It is easy to see how יִסְפְּרוּ (*talk*) may have taken the place of the rare form יִסְפִּי, or even of יוֹסִיפוּ. And then how forcible is the cry which follows ! “ Put (תְּנֶה) guilt to their guilt ” ; deal with them as they have dealt with their victims.

In Psalm lxxii. 5 the case is not so clear, but the variant suggested by the LXX. has a strong claim for consideration. The text reads :

“ They shall fear Thee while the sun endureth.”

If God is addressed, the sequence of wishes for the welfare of the king is interrupted ; if the king is addressed, it is contrary to the general plan of the psalm, in which he is nowhere else addressed. The LXX., καὶ συμπαράμενέῃ, and he shall endure, points to a reading וַיֵּאָרֶךְ, which differs from the Massoretic וַיֵּאָרֶךְ, so far as the consonants are concerned, by little more than a transposition of letters.

In Jeremiah xxiii. 33 the Massoretic text has :

“ When this people . . . shall ask thee, saying, What is the burden of the LORD ? then shalt thou say unto them, What burden ? ”
(אֶת-מַה-מְשָׁא).

The construction of the last clause is difficult to justify. But the reading implied by the LXX. and supported by the Vulgate at once rectifies the grammar, and gives a far more forcible sense to the prophet's answer :

"Ye are the burden (בִּשְׁמֵי יְהוָה), and I will fling you off, saith Jehovah."

Yet all the change needed is a different division and punctuation of the Hebrew consonants.

One more example, from Ezekiel xl. 44. The context (vv. 45, 46) makes it clear that this verse must be corrected in accordance with the LXX. (see R.V. margin), somewhat thus :

"And without the inner gate were two chambers in the inner court, one at the side of the north gate, and its prospect was toward the south ; and one at the side of the south gate, having its prospect toward the north,"

i.e., לְשִׁכּוֹת שְׂרָיִם for לְשִׁכּוֹת שָׂרִים. The mention of the singers disappears.

Instances might be multiplied indefinitely, but it is unnecessary to do so. I have no wish to exaggerate the imperfections of the Hebrew text, or the amount of help to be derived from the LXX. Taken as a whole, the Masoretic Text is far superior to the LXX. or any text that could be recovered from it ; but the more I study some of the more difficult parts of the Old Testament, the more I feel compelled to think it probable that much of their difficulty arises from deep-seated corruptions of the text.

2. I can do no more than just call your attention to my second point, namely, the evidence of the LXX. that in the early period of the textual history of the Old Testament some books at least were in circulation in forms so different that they may be called *different recensions*. This was the case with the books of Jeremiah and Proverbs, and, in a less degree, with those of Samuel, Kings, and Job. The char-

acter of the variations is such as to make it improbable that they were all due to the arbitrary will of the translators. I do not say that it was a better recension than the Massoretic Text; I simply point to the fact that the evidence proves that the uniformity of our Hebrew MSS. is a phenomenon of late growth, and that the Old Testament was read by different parts of the Jewish Church, in the pre-Christian period, in forms which differed not a little one from another.

VII.

(ii.) I pass on to my second main topic—the use of the LXX. in the Church.

“It was universally accepted by the Jews of the Dispersion as their text of Scripture. The oldest Hellenists, Demetrius and Eupolemus, in their compilations of Scripture history, rely solely upon the Septuagint. Philo throughout assumes it, Josephus does so for the most part. With Philo, the text of the LXX. is so far a sacred text that he argues from its casual details. Not only was it used in private, it was read as Holy Scripture in the Synagogue. It was then transferred from the hands of the Jews to the Christian Church, and regarded by it as the authentic text of Scripture.”¹

It was, in the main, the Bible of Evangelists and Apostles. According to one calculation, “out of 350 quotations from the Old Testament in the New Testament, not more than 50 differ materially from the LXX.”² According to another, out of 275 passages quoted from the Old Testament in the New, there are 37 in which the LXX. differs materially from the Hebrew.³

The Fathers of the Church were, with rare exceptions, dependent on it. Few of them knew enough Hebrew to

¹ Schürer, ii. iii. 163; ii. ii. 285.

² Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, iii. 1209 a.

³ See Turpie, *The Old Testament in the New*, p. 267.

consult the original; probably not one made substantial use of it before Jerome. All the Versions were made from it, except to some extent the later Greek Versions, the Targums, the Syriac, and the Vulgate, and even the Syriac shows traces of having been extensively revised from it.¹ The Old Latin, the Egyptian (Coptic, Memphitic, Sahidic), the Æthiopic, the Arabic, the Armenian, the Georgian, the Gothic, the Slavonic, were all made from it. Until Jerome's translation appeared, the whole of Christendom, except the Syrian Church, was directly or indirectly dependent on it.

The names of many of the books of the Old Testament serve to remind us of its influence. Genesis, Exodus, and so forth, are not Hebrew but Greek titles. We find traces of it in the Prayer-Book Psalter. That Version, taken from the Great Bible, is substantially the work of Coverdale (1535). One of Coverdale's sources was the Vulgate; and it must be remembered that in the Psalter the Vulgate is not Jerome's new translation from the Hebrew, but the Old Latin Version made from the LXX. Coverdale corrected a great many wrong renderings, but he frequently left additions standing. Thus in Psalm xiv. 5-7 he retained the passage which has been interpolated in the LXX. from Romans iii. 10-12. In Psalm vii. 11, "God is a righteous Judge, *strong and patient*," is derived, through the Vulgate *Deus iudex iustus, fortis et patiens*, from the LXX.; *strong* being a rendering of *גָּבִיר* in the next clause, and *patient* being apparently a gloss.

It may help you to realize what this absolute dependence of the Christian Church on the LXX. for its knowledge of the Old Testament meant, if I endeavour to give you a literal translation from the LXX. of the familiar passage, Isaiah ix. 1-7.

¹ W. Wright, *Syriac Literature*, p. 3.

1. This first drink thou,¹ do quickly, country of Zabulon, land of Nephthaleim; and the rest that are on the sea coast and beyond Jordan, Galilee of the nations.

2. O people that walketh in darkness, see ye a great light; ye that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, light shall shine upon you.

3. The greatest part of the people which Thou broughtest back in Thy rejoicing, they shall even rejoice before Thee as those that rejoice in harvest, and as those who divide spoils.

4. For the yoke that was laid upon them is removed, and the rod that was upon their neck: for the rod of their exactors hath He scattered, as in the day against Midian.

5. For every robe gathered by guile and [every] garment shall they repay with compensation, and they shall delight if they were burned with fire [?].

6. For a Child is born to us, a Son is given to us, upon whose shoulder shall be the rule, and His name is called the Angel of great counsel: for I will bring peace upon the rulers, and health to Him.

7. Great shall be His rule, and of His peace there is no limit, upon the throne of David and his kingdom to establish it and help it, in judgment and in righteousness, from this time forth and for ever: the zeal of the Lord of Hosts will do these things.

That is a specimen of the Version upon which the Fathers were dependent; perhaps rather an unfair specimen of the Old Testament as a whole, but hardly of the prophetical books. Yet one writer after another argues from it as if it were the authentic and authoritative text of Holy Scripture. There is an interesting article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography* (vol. ii., pp. 851 ff.) on *Hebrew Learning among the Fathers*, from which I borrow some of the following illustrations of the dependence of the Fathers upon the LXX., and of the authority which they attributed to it.

Justin Martyr (c. 148 A.D.), though born at Flavia Neapolis, close to Sychem in Samaria, was wholly ignorant of Hebrew, and appears to be unconscious of the disadvantage at which his ignorance placed him in his controversy with the Jews. He was entirely dependent on the LXX., and was indignant with the Jewish teachers

¹ *πτε* must be a corruption in the Greek for *ποτε*.

who presumed to doubt its correctness.¹ In c. 49 of the *Dialogue with Trypho*, he quotes the LXX. of Exodus xvii. 16; and, though it differs widely from the Hebrew, and has no claim to be regarded as representing a better text, he bases his argument upon it, applying it to the first coming of Christ in humility. "It is said that the Lord made war with Amalek *with a secret hand* (ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαῇ), and that Amalek fell, ye will not deny. But if it is meant that only in the glorious Advent of Christ will Amalek be defeated, what fruit will there be of the saying, For with a secret hand God makes war with Amalek. Ye can understand that the secret power of God belonged to the crucified Christ. . . ."

Tertullian (c. 150–220 A.D.) was naturally dependent on the Old Latin Version; and he too argues from it when it does not represent the Hebrew, and has no claim to be preferred to it. One instance may suffice. In his treatise *Against the Jews*, c. 7, he quotes Isaiah xlv. 1 as a prophecy of Christ: *Sic dicit Dominus Deus Christo meo domino*. It is obvious that for Κύριος the text upon which the version was based read κυρίῳ, an error evidently which had crept into the Greek text by a transcriber's mistake (cp. *Adv. Marc.*, iii. 7).

In c. 14 of the same treatise he quotes Jeremiah xvii. 9 as a prophecy of the lowly estate of Christ, unrecognised in His life on earth. *Homo est et quis cognoscet illum?* where the LXX. evidently misread אָנִישׁ for אֲנִישׁ (A.V. *desperately sick*). In another passage (*de Carne Christi*, c. 15) he uses it as a proof-text of the true humanity of Christ. Irenæus, Cyprian, Lactantius, Augustine, make similar use of the passage, "with good intention," as Jerome observes, "but not according to knowledge."

¹ *Dial. cum Tryphone*, c. 68: "Shall I not shame you into disbelieving your teachers, who presume to say that the translation made by your seventy elders who were at the court of Ptolemy, king of the Egyptians, is in some respects not true?" Cp. c. 71.

Origen (A.D. 185–253) stands upon a different level. He “recognised the necessity of learning Hebrew that he might be confident as to the original form of the records of the Old Testament”; yet, though he maintained the significance of every word of Scripture, “he seems to have contented himself with being able to identify the Hebrew corresponding to the Greek texts before him. . . . In his Homilies he constantly follows the Greek text, where it differs widely from the Hebrew, without marking the variation,” and “when he marks the variation he gives no paramount authority to the Hebrew text, but keeps faithfully to the LXX.”¹ Thus in support of his theory of the triple sense of Scripture he appeals (*Philocalia*, c. i. = *de Princip.*, iv. 11) to the erroneous rendering of Proverbs xxii. 20: καὶ σὺ δὲ ἀπόγραψαι αὐτὰ τρισσῶς. “Such,” he says, “is that which we believe to be the right method of reading and understanding the Scriptures, as may be deduced from the Oracles themselves. In the writings of Solomon in the Proverbs we find something of this kind enjoined concerning the Divine precepts which have been committed to writing, ‘Do thou copy them out for thyself *in threefold wise* in counsel and knowledge, that thou mayest answer words of truth unto the questions that are proposed to thee.’ In threefold wise, therefore, must every man copy into his own mind the sense of the holy writings.”

The learned scholar and historian, Eusebius of Cæsarea, certainly possessed some knowledge of Hebrew. He quotes the renderings of the other Greek Versions, and compares them and the LXX. with the Hebrew; yet he frequently argues from the LXX., even where he knows that it differs from the Versions which represented the original more exactly. Thus, for example, in *Demonstr. Evang.*, vi. 15, he takes the strange Septuagint rendering of Habakkuk iii. 2, ἐν μέσῳ δύο ζώων γνωσθήσῃ, and reading ζῶν (*lives*)

¹ Bp. Westcott, in *Dict. of Christian Biogr.*, iv. 132.

for ζώων (*animals*), he applies the passage to Christ, who “was known in the midst of two lives, divine and human, mortal and immortal.” This passage indeed was a favourite one with the Fathers, who propounded the strangest allegorical interpretations of it. Its exegesis furnishes, as Dean Farrar remarks,¹ “a good specimen of fancy, working without restraint and without any guiding principle on the material of pure mistake.”

Hilary, adopting the erroneous rendering *in finem* (“unto the end”) for לְכַנְנִיחַ (“For the Precentor”), derived from the LXX. εἰς τέλος, argued from it that the Psalms which bore this title referred to Christ. Similarly, too, Augustine constantly finds mystical meanings in impossible renderings of the titles of the Psalms in the Latin Version, based upon the LXX., which he used.

Instances might be multiplied indefinitely. I have only named a few typical Fathers, and taken a few typical examples from their works. But enough has been said to show the almost absolute dependence of the Christian Church upon the LXX. and the Versions made from the LXX. down to the time of Jerome, and the unhesitating confidence with which its text was quoted as the *ipsissima verba* of Scripture, upon which arguments might legitimately be based.

VIII.

(iii.). In conclusion, what inference is to be drawn from the facts (1) that on the one hand even the Hebrew text of the Old Testament has not been preserved intact and free from error and (2) that on the other hand the Old Testament was only known to and used by the Christian Church for centuries in a form so strikingly divergent from the *Hebraica veritas*? Surely not the inference which Grinfield endeavoured to draw in his *Apology for the Septuagint*, that

¹ *Hist. of Interpretation*, p. 124.

the LXX. was of canonical authority co-ordinate with that of the original text; but rather that the provision of an infallible text of the Bible and the provision of an authoritative and inerrant interpretation of it were not part of God's purpose.

Those matters which lay within the province of man were left to men. Scribes and translators are liable to err, and they erred. They made mistakes, as they did in the case of secular books. No divine Providence preserved them from error, either in transcribing or in translating.

Yet in spite of all the errors of the LXX., in spite of the marvellous methods of interpretation founded upon those errors, the Book, the Library of Books, fulfilled its purpose. The LXX. was truly, as Eusebius calls it (*Praep. Evang.*, viii. 1), *θεόθεν οἰκονομηθεῖσα ἐρμηνεία*, a divinely provided translation of the Old Testament. Here was a voice of God speaking to men as a living oracle, as no other books spoke or could speak; witnessing to the action of the living God in the affairs of men, testifying to His righteousness, His truth, His holiness. The Spirit spoke, though He spoke through the lips of men, as it were in stammering accents and often unintelligible words. On the whole the *regula fidei*, the tradition of Christian doctrine, kept men's minds in the right direction amid all the strange intricacies and vagaries of allegorical interpretation; and much true and noble and elevating spiritual thought is to be found even where it fails as argument because it lacks solid foundation.

I do not know whether you will follow me in finding these considerations reassuring in view of the difficulties which many devout students of the Bible feel are raised by modern criticism of the Old Testament. In the domain of the lower or textual criticism we find that the preservation of an infallible original text, and the provision of an accurate translation, were no part of the Divine purpose.

The things which were within man's power were left to men. Need we be startled if the "Higher Criticism" discloses to us that something analogous was the case in regard to the original composition of the Scriptures? if we are compelled to recognise that the human elements of personality, time, locality, are larger than we once supposed? Holy men of old spake indeed as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; but they spake not only in the language, but according to the modes of thought of their times. Need we be dismayed if modern investigation tells us that they composed their histories according to the methods of Oriental historiography, compiling, combining, altering, modifying, the works of their predecessors? Need we be shocked if we find reason to believe that they employed allegory as the vehicle of teaching because it was the regular mode of instruction, the only mode available for a people to whom abstract thought was unnatural, the only mode capable of lasting for all time and speaking with force to young and old, learned and unlearned alike? Need we be alarmed if we find that works were written in the name of illustrious persons of a bygone age with the intention of expressing their thoughts real or supposed? Need we be troubled if it be proved that the scribes amplified and edited the work of previous generations with a freedom which amazes us?

God speaks through, nay, even in spite of, the imperfections of His human instruments, and His word "effectually worketh in them that believe."

But do not mistake me. It is no part of the Divine purpose that we should rest content with imperfection. It is the duty of each age to strive to go forward in its study and interpretation of Holy Scripture. It is our duty, by the most diligent application of the principles of textual criticism, to labour to recover so far as may be the original words of Scripture; by every aid of grammar and lexicography to

endeavour to understand their meaning; by full use of literary and historical criticism, of archæology, of comparison of other religions, to bring them into due relation to the circumstances under which they were written, the influences by which they were moulded, the needs they were designed to meet; and then by a principle of proportion and analogy to ascertain their message and their meaning for our own age. How God has worked, is working, and purposes to work, in us and through us, in society, in the world, for the accomplishment of that supreme end when He shall be all in all—this is what we need and desire to learn, that we may “grow by the knowledge of God,” and bear fruit to His glory.

A. F. KIRKPATRICK.

CHRISTIANS AND SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(1 PETER II. 11—III. 7.)

IN the earlier part of the second chapter of this Epistle Peter describes the ideal greatness of all Christian people, and their place in the invisible and eternal kingdom of God. God is building for Himself in this world a spiritual temple; Christ is the chief corner stone, and we, one by one, as living stones, are built on Him. God has His earthly home in the life of Christian men of all Churches, of every nation, every creed. Every Christian man is a divine temple; according to Paul, God dwells in him: but Peter describes the whole company of saints—all who have received the eternal life which is the gift of Christ—as one great, majestic, glorious temple of the Eternal. And we are a holy, a consecrated priesthood. We have to offer spiritual sacrifices. We are an elect race, holy, a consecrated nation, a people that God has made His own possession, called out of darkness into God’s marvellous light.

In these great conceptions of the dignity, sanctity, and

blessedness of all that acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ as the Lord and Saviour of mankind, are to be discovered the true laws of Christian morality, and the inspiration and strength that will enable us to fulfil them.

Peter begins with a general law rooted in his description of the ideal greatness of all Christian men (ii. 11). In this world, all that he has said about us shows that we are "*sojourners*," strangers, not citizens; "*pilgrims*," passing travellers. We are to "*abstain from fleshly lusts*," which would destroy that diviner life in the power of which we belong to God's invisible and eternal kingdom. And considering to what a great race we belong, and that we are priests consecrated to God's service, and are God's temple, we are to have our behaviour "*seemly*," or "*beautiful*," among those who as yet do not share our blessedness; "*that wherein they speak against*" us "*as evil-doers*"—a common reproach against Christian men in early times—they may by our "*good works which they themselves behold*," come to "*glorify God in the day of visitation*." When the light of God begins to break upon them, and their hearts and consciences are moved by the revelation of God in Christ, their knowledge of the moral excellence of those who have received the Christian faith is to add new force to the Christian gospel, and to constrain them to receive it, and so to glorify God. Two great motives, therefore, are alleged to enforce the discharge of two great duties. That life which we have received from God will perish if we indulge in fleshly lusts—we should, therefore, abstain from them: and our lives are to be beautiful and full of good works, that men may be assisted by our conduct to discover the righteousness and power and love of God in Christ.

And now the Apostle passes to a series of special precepts, which are intimately connected with each other, and all of which are indeed varied applications of one general principle. We must try to grasp the general principle first.

Christian men belong, in the power of their higher life, to the invisible and eternal kingdom of God. Yes—but they are surrounded by a great system of laws and institutions of altogether a different kind. Imagine the spirit and temper with which these laws and institutions were likely to be regarded by the Christian men to whom this Epistle was written.

The times were evil. An immense heathen empire extended over the greater part of the known world. It was under the absolute control and direction of one man, and he was sometimes guilty of the foulest vices and the most brutal crimes: sometimes he had gained power by base, treacherous, and bloody cruelties; and sometimes he used his power tyrannically and brutally. The governors, who under him held authority over subject nations, were sometimes guilty of similar tyranny and similar brutality. The Roman rule had many great and noble qualities; and Roman emperors, governors, and magistrates exhibited many great and noble virtues. But the rule was, in its foundation, a military despotism; and the rulers were tempted to commit the iniquities which are almost inseparable from the possession of arbitrary power.

The Jews had always been impatient of foreign control; they were God's elect race, and they resented the authority of heathen princes. They were turbulent and ungovernable, and were only held down by the iron hand of irresistible force. The same temper was likely to spread in the Christian Churches, in which at first there was a large number of Jews, who brought with them their hatred of the Roman power. And Christian men might justify their resistance of political and civil authority by insisting on the greatness and sanctity which God had conferred on them in Christ. Were they not the people of God—God's own possession, a consecrated nation, an elect race, with the immunities of a royal priesthood? What right had a

heathen emperor, heathen governors, heathen magistrates, to exert authority over them? Were they not under the laws of the true and eternal God? What obligation rested on them to honour the laws of a heathen state? And the social economy of the empire—was it not an outrage on the dignity with which God Himself had invested them? They were the sons of the Eternal—and yet they were slaves. It was intolerable. What duty did they owe to heathen masters, who sometimes treated them with cruel injustice? And the social institutions of this heathen society, the obligations which it imposed on them—might not these too be wholly disregarded? Christian wives—especially those who were married to heathen husbands—might they not leave them, if they wished to leave them? Were they bound by any indissoluble ties to men who did not share their kinship to God, and the transcendent greatness which that kinship conferred? If they remained with their husbands, were they under the old obligations which were irksome always, and which now that they had the spirit of Christian freedom were harder to discharge than ever? And Christian husbands—had their wives any serious claims on them? What was marriage? It was an institution belonging to this transitory world—to this visible order. What obligations could it impose on men who were sons of God and heirs of glory, honour, and immortality?

We can see that general temper which the Christian people were likely to show in relation to all earthly institutions might be justified by an appeal to the most certain and glorious truths concerning the Christian life and the great Christian hope. Those who had passed into the kingdom of God—what allegiance did they owe to heathen emperors and magistrates; what obedience did they owe to human laws? Those who had passed into the invisible and eternal order—how could they be bound by the visible order of society, with the temporary institutions of this

brief and transient earthly life? In the first age there was a suspicion, as has been justly said, that Christian Churches were a kind of Internationalist and Socialistic conspiracy against the empire and against the social order; men spoke against Christians as against "*evildoers*."

Peter meets this temper by charging Christian men to "*be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake*." That is the general law: the special precepts which follow are the various applications of it. The expression which Peter uses is a very remarkable one. In the margin of the Revised Version the word "*creation*" is given instead of "*ordinance*"; and "*creation*" is the word which most exactly represents what Peter said. Now the word "*creation*" is never used in the New Testament, I think, for what is merely human in its origin. Only God creates.

Further: Peter does not say, "*every creation of man*," but "*every human creation*." "*Be subject to every human creation for the Lord's sake*." What is his exact meaning?

When we speak of God's material creations, we speak of the manifestations of His will and power in the material universe, and through matter. The manifestations are incomplete, for matter cannot wholly express the divine thought. The artist, the poet, discovers in mountains, in seas, in clouds, in trees, in flowers, a grandeur, a beauty, a grace, which the actual mountains, seas, clouds, trees, and flowers realize only imperfectly. God's material creations do not fully achieve the divine thought and purpose.

And God's *human creations* to which we are to be "*subject*," are the expression of God's thought and purpose—in the organization of human society—in the political and social order of nations—in whatever earthly institutions are necessary to the existence and perfection of the life of man. His human creations express His mind still less perfectly than His material creations, for men are in revolt against His authority; their selfishness, their covetousness, their

lust, their ambition, their cruelty, interfere with the working out of His great and merciful purpose. But still they are His creations—marred, imperfect, sometimes hardly recognisable as His. We are His creations; but how terribly we misrepresent His thought and will in our personal life and conduct. And the State, Society, the Family are His creations; but they are His human creations—creations which He achieves through the intervention of human life with all its immoralities, of human relations with all their perversities, of human wisdom with all its grievous errors.

The State, Society, the Family—I repeat—are divine creations—institutions which have their root and origin in the divine will. We are so made that we must live in families: we are so made that we must live in an organized society: we are so made that we must be drawn into the unity of national life, under government and under law. Apart from the existence of the Family, of the social order, of the State, the development of man's life is checked; many of his highest powers are unexercised, many of his noblest qualities undeveloped. As these institutions have their foundation in the Divine purpose, we are to recognise and fulfil the obligations which they impose—to discharge the service which they assign to us, "*for the Lord's sake.*"

If the words were taken as they stand—"Be subject to every ordinance of man"—they would debase human life and strip it of all its dignity and freedom. I am not bound by any law, natural or Christian, to submit to everything that *man* may ordain—to every ordinance of man; but I am bound to submit to every divine institution which is organized and maintained through human agency—though through human weakness, ignorance, and sin, it may grievously fail to realize the divine idea.

Be subject to every institution intended by God to organize and regulate the life of man—acknowledge and

discharge the services it demands. Be subject to the political order—"to the king, as supreme" (ii. 14-17).

Be subject to every institution intended by God to organize and regulate the life of man. Peter addresses the precept even to slaves. In the social order of the ancient world slavery had a large place. It was an atrociously unjust institution. The social order based upon it was iniquitous. But some organization of society was necessary, according to the will of God. Men had terribly missed their way in carrying out His will, but as long as that order existed and there was no possibility of changing it for a better, Christian people were to submit—to submit even to cruel injustice, as Christ submitted (ii. 18-24).

Be subject to every institution intended to organize and regulate the life of man: now he addresses the precept to Christian wives:—they are to discharge the duties of married life (iii. 1-7). And then to husbands: "*in like manner*"—like the wives—like the slaves—like the subjects of political rulers—husbands, too, are to be subject to the institution of marriage. It would have been too great a shock if he had said, in like manner be in subjection to your wives; but the idea of being subject to the obligations imposed by marriage—which is a divine institution, though receiving its form through human laws—is present in the charge to husbands as well as in the charge to wives. Husbands are not to be arbitrary, tyrannical. They are not to suppose themselves at liberty to order everything according to their own will. They are to dwell with their wives "*according to knowledge*,"—having an intelligent perception of what is involved in their relation to their wives, "*giving honour to the woman as unto the weaker vessel, as being also joint-heirs of the grace of life; to the end that your prayers be not hindered.*"

Not in the spiritual and eternal world alone does God reveal His glory. In this material universe we may dis-

cover the manifestations of His eternal power and Godhead—manifestations too coarse to be the vehicle of His finer thought, too infirm to bear the weight of His nobler perfection, but still manifestations, though inadequate, of His eternal power and Godhead. I reverence the material universe as a divine creation.

In the individual life of man, in his intellect, in his moral power and qualities, in his social affections, in his spiritual greatness, God is also revealed; but in many millions of men how imperfectly! The light of the intellect—how dim it is; the moral powers—how feeble, how perverse; the moral qualities—how degenerate; the social affections—how irregular; and the spiritual greatness—ah! too often man is a prince uncrowned—a priest who has been degraded from his sacred functions—a child of God in rags, in a far country, feeding swine, instead of in royal robes in the palace of his Father! But still the individual man is a divine creation, and I reverence him.

And the State—how corrupt, how tyrannical, how unjust sometimes are its rulers, how unequal its laws! Still it is a divine creation, and I reverence it. “The powers that be are ordained of God,” however grievously they may fail to fulfil their trust.

The order of Society—how far it falls short of the divine ideal! But I will not break into revolt; I will endeavour to change its form by changing its spirit. I will discharge the services it demands from me, however inequitable. Any order is better than chaos. I will recognise and honour the divine idea, even when most undivinely realized.

The Family is divine; and let wives fulfil the divine idea of what wives should be, even when husbands forget the will of God: and let husbands fulfil the divine idea of what husbands ought to be, even when wives forget the will of God—each being gracious to the ungracious, gentle to the ungente, loyal to the disloyal. And the same law extends

to the mutual relations of children and parents : from the child reverence is due to the parent—not because he is wise and just and good ; reverence is due to every man—parent or not—that is wise and great and good : reverence is due to the parent because he is the parent : the relation between parent and child is a divine institution, and the child should be subject to the institution. And to the child the parent owes duties by the same law—to the disobedient child, the ungrateful child, the unloving child. “*For the Lord’s sake*” we must recognise and discharge all the duties and services required from us by the institutions for the organization of human life ; and when for His sake these duties and services are recognised and discharged, we shall have done something towards bringing on the golden age we long for—when all states and all laws shall be just, and the social order shall illustrate the spirit of Christian brotherhood, and the Family shall be the visible symbol of the peace and blessedness of the Home of God.

R. W. DALE.

JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

IV. THE SYNAGOGUE MINISTRY.

THE first thing the average reader of the Gospels has to do in reference to this department of our Lord’s work is to get it fairly into his mind that there was such a thing as a systematic synagogue ministry. With the exception of the narratives relating to visits made to the two synagogues of Capernaum and Nazareth, the Gospels contain only general statements, such as that in Mark i. 39 : “He preached in their synagogues throughout all Galilee, and cast out devils.”¹ Such summary notices, giving no details, make little impression on the mind. You read the words, pass

¹ *Vide also in Matthew iv. 23.*

on, and the fact briefly stated takes no place in your permanent conception of Christ's evangelistic activities. Even when we pause to reflect for a moment on what these general statements say, we are apt to think that they are not to be taken in earnest, as pointing to a deliberately planned, persistent, extensive effort to bring to the ears of the men of Galilee, through the convenient medium of the synagogue, the good news of the Kingdom of God.

The clearest evidence that this is a mistaken view is contained in Mark i. 38, where Jesus is represented as giving such a preconceived plan as His reason for leaving Capernaum. "Let us go into the next towns, that I may preach there also ; for therefore came I forth." He has addressed a Sabbath audience in one synagogue, and He desires to do the same elsewhere. The manner of His departure lends emphasis to the purpose. It was hasty, because He feared that the time of His Galilean ministry might be cut short, and His preaching mission interrupted, by the enmity of the scribes. A synagogue-ministry, as distinct from a street-ministry, depended on the good-will of others, and Jesus understood that it must begin at once if it was to be at all. The departure was secret, before the dawn, while men slept, because He feared detention by a people valuing His presence for the healing power displayed on so splendid a scale on the previous Sabbath evening. Evidently Jesus is very much in earnest about that preaching tour. It is not an afterthought, or a pretext, but a fixed purpose ; one of the main lines along which He means to conduct His work as the Light of Galilee. The prayer with which He ushered in the day on the eventful morning of that flight from Capernaum shows the same thing. In the life of Jesus, protracted solitary prayer was ever the prelude of important undertakings.

The plan was a large one. "In their synagogues throughout all Galilee": that meant many sermons. In

the time of our Lord there were many towns in that province large enough to have at least one synagogue. Josephus gives the number at 204, the smallest of them having 15,000 inhabitants.¹ Even supposing, with many modern scholars, that there is some mistake or exaggeration in the statement, it witnesses indubitably to a very thickly-peopled country. What a time it would take to go over all these towns, even if advantage were taken of the week-day meetings on Mondays and Fridays, as well as of the more solemn assemblies for worship on the Sabbaths. The scheme would assume more manageable dimensions if the purpose was to visit chiefly the smaller towns. This is suggested by the Greek phrase for which the English equivalent in the Authorised Version is "next towns," the literal meaning being the next *village*-towns.² It is not improbable that Jesus, knowing that a selection must be made, resolved to visit, in the first place, the lesser centres of population, having possibly only a single synagogue. He might be led to adopt this course by various considerations: His deep yearning to preach the gospel to the *poor*, the likelihood of greater receptivity to His message among *villagers*, the hope that much good work might thus be done *quietly*, with smaller risk of attracting the sinister attention of the religious authorities.

How far did Jesus succeed in carrying out His beneficent plan? The expression "all Galilee," used by the Evangelists, would seem to point to complete execution. But perhaps we ought not to press the "all," but take the fact to be that a very considerable number of places were visited in succession so as to justify such a colloquial exaggeration. This speaks to an interval of months between the time of Christ's departure from Capernaum to that of His return. From Mark ii. 1 indeed we might infer that the period con-

¹ *Vide his Vita*, chap. xlv., and *B. J.*, iii. 3, 2.

² *eis τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις* (Mark i. 38).

sisted of only a few days. But a slightly altered grouping of the words does away with that impression. Instead of the rendering in the Authorised Version: "And again He entered into Capernaum after some days, and it was noised that He was in the house," we may substitute: "And He entered again into Capernaum, and after some days the report went abroad: He is home." The situation is easily conceivable. Jesus returns almost as quietly as He went away. He is some days in the town before they know. But when they know, what lively interest in the fact! The memory of events now some months old revives: the marvellous address in the synagogue, followed by an equally marvellous cure; the marvels of the day crowned and eclipsed by the wholesale healing ministry of the evening. They say to one another: the great Preacher and Healer is back among us again. "He is home."

Yes! home and welcome to most, but not to all. The situation is altered somewhat. The scribes are on the alert. So when the crowd gathers around the newly returned Master some of them are present to watch what goes on. And when a poor paralysed man, physically and morally a wreck, is brought to be healed, and Jesus, going to the root of the evil and aiming at reviving the smoking wick of hope in the poor sufferer's breast, says in cordial tones: "Courage, child! thy sins are forgiven," the scribes, by look though not by audible word, say: "Why does this person thus speak? he blasphemeth." Here at last is the mischief Jesus instinctively feared from the first, the well-grounded dread making him anxious to start on the preaching tour as quickly as possible, in hope to get over a considerable amount of ground before the latent antagonism began to reveal itself in active attempts at frustration. What if such attempts have brought Him back to Capernaum sooner than He otherwise would have come? What if secret correspondence between the scribes of Capernaum

and the rulers of synagogues in other towns have resulted in closed doors, opportunities of speech refused, a beneficent plan broken off half executed? It is not unlikely. Reading between the lines, we get this as a not improbable version of the story. Jesus meant to evangelise all Galilee, and He did actually preach in not a few synagogues, but ecclesiastical wire-pulling interrupted His work; the scribes compelled Him to return prematurely home, and they were there to watch him on His return.

Concerning the synagogue-ministry, we have, as already indicated, little definite information. Yet we are not so entirely in the dark as to its nature as we might at first imagine. We know the general features of that ministry, the estimates formed of it by the people and by the evangelists, and at least the text of one of the addresses.

1. The general features were *preaching, teaching, and healing* according to Matthew, *preaching and casting out devils* according to Mark. By preaching as distinct from teaching may be understood the proclamation of the elementary truths concerning the kingdom of God as a kingdom of grace: the paternal love of God, the hope that is in His mercy for the most sinful, the worth of man to God even at the worst, the duty of repentance, and the possibilities of sanctity for the penitent. By teaching, on the other hand, is denoted instruction in the theory, so to speak, of the kingdom: its absolute worth, its imperial claims, its moral ideal in itself and in contrast to current conceptions. From the nature of the case, and from the omission by Mark of any separate mention of teaching it is probable that *preaching* was the staple element in our Lord's synagogue discourses. Teaching was for disciples, preaching for the people. That healing acts were a frequent accompaniment of the preaching goes without saying. For even if Jesus did not start on His Galilæan mission with a set purpose to heal, He was always willing to give succour on

demand. And as disease is everywhere, and the desire for healing is not less universal, it may be taken for granted that there were few of the village towns where something similar to the incident in the Capernaum synagogue did not happen: demoniacal possession or some other human ailment cured by the Preacher to the astonishment of all. The story of Christ's visit to the synagogue in Capernaum may be taken as a sample of what occurred all over Galilee. One exception indeed is specified, and it may be viewed as an exception which proves the rule. Jesus, it is recorded, did no mighty work in *Nazareth*; ¹ not for want of sick people, nor for want of power, but because the villagers would not give Him the chance. They were so chagrined at a fellow-townsmen being so distinguished that they would rather let their diseased relatives die than give Him an opportunity of showing His greatness. So far can prejudice go.²

2. The reported estimates of the synagogue ministry are various. That of the people, as is their way, was merely emotional, an expression of honest and intense admiration: What is this? A new teaching! and an unheard-of kind of power! That of the evangelists gives us some insight into the quality of the preaching which immediately created popular surprise. Mark uses the method of comparison: He taught not as the scribes; they *by* authority citing Rabbis of reputation in support of their dogmas; He *with* authority citing nobody, speaking out the intuitions of the soul, and leaving these to commend themselves to the minds of ingenuous hearers. Luke comes nearest to the heart of the matter when he employs the expression "words of grace" to characterise the utterance of Christ in the synagogue of Nazareth. I believe we shall not go

¹ Mark vi. 5.

² Euthymius Zigabenus, a Greek monk of the tenth century, author of a fine commentary on the Gospels, remarks: "It was not for Jesus to benefit them against their will" (οὐκ ἔδει βίαιως εὐεργετεῖν αὐτούς).

far wrong if we take that phrase as applicable not merely to that particular discourse, but to the synagogue discourses generally, and view it as referring not chiefly to graceful diction, but rather to gracious thought,—to matter rather than to manner. Gracious thought concerning the loving-kindness of God, sweetly and winsomely spoken, that in Nazareth and everywhere was the burden of Christ's synagogue sermons. Not that the Preacher is a man of one idea. He has many thoughts about the Kingdom, some of them deep and abstruse, fit only for the disciplined ear of the few; some of them severe and exacting; some of them stern in their bearing on the teaching and practice of the scribes and Pharisees; all of which He utters on due occasion. But the grace of God is His favourite theme. The Gospel of Divine love runs like a sweet melody through the rich, varied, sublime harmonies of His religious teaching. That God is good, that He is a Father, that He shows His goodwill to all in manifold ways in His ordinary providence; that He careth for the weak, the lowly, and even the low; that in Him is plenteous redemption, even for those whom men despair of: such were the things He delighted to say, said to all He met, and wished to say once at least in the hearing of all to whom He could gain access. Therefore, while there was doubtless endless variety in the colouring and contents of His synagogue addresses, there would be a certain pervading similarity, perhaps some ideas deliberately repeated in unvarying forms of language; for all great teachers who have some very decided message to deliver are apt to repeat themselves, not in helplessness, but because they cannot satisfy themselves without saying, and saying again and again.

3. The *text* of the address in the synagogue of Nazareth beginning, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me," happily preserved by Luke, supplied the best possible key-note for such gracious discourse. That it is historical I doubt not,

but it is also typical. It is the kind of text Jesus would choose for a popular sermon. The Scripture He was to preach from might not always be in His power. He might oftenest have to take His theme from the fixed lesson for the day in the Law or in the Prophets. Nothing, however, could come wrong to Him, for He knew His Bible intimately, and had some deep spiritual thought in His mind associated with every important passage, which He could utter in fitting language on the spur of the moment. Think, for example, what He brought out *impromptu* from the superficially unpromising words: "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."¹ From the greater number of Old Testament texts, whether selected by Himself or given to His hand, He would have no difficulty in eliciting the veritable Gospel of the Kingdom under one or another of its aspects by most legitimate exegesis. For no one knows till he has examined into the matter how much that is truly evangelic in spirit is to be found in the Hebrew Scriptures: in Genesis, in Deuteronomy, in the Psalter, and in the Prophets; how much that is in full sympathy with the splendid text from Isaiah which formed the theme of the Nazareth discourse concerning the anointing of Messiah to preach good tidings to the meek and to bind up the broken-hearted. One of the causes of admiration in our Lord's synagogue audiences would be the ease and naturalness with which He drew from familiar words precious truths which they had never seen there before, turning what had appeared "flint into a fountain of waters."² And when the word even to the popular view was manifestly not flint but fountain, another cause of admiration would be the happy manner in which, as if by a spell, He cleared the fountain of polluting, choking matter, so that its waters appeared pellucid as crystal, inviting the thirsty to drink from a pure well of salvation.

¹ Matt. xxii. 32; Mark xii. 27; Luke xx. 38.

² Ps. cxiv. 8.

“Let us make man in our image”; “I have surely seen the affliction of My people which are in Egypt”; “the earth is full of the goodness of the Lord”; “With Him is plenteous redemption”; “Thou, O Lord, art our Father”; “In Thee the fatherless findeth mercy”; “Is Ephraim my dear son? is he a pleasant child? for since I spake against him I do earnestly remember him still”; “I will put My law in their inward parts”—what thrilling, gracious, unforgettable words Jesus could speak on such texts, making the hearts of His hearers burn as He talked to them on the Sabbath days! The synagogue teaching of the scribes was dry-as-dust even when they stumbled on obstacles like these, but that was their fault, not the fault of the sacred words. It was their unhappy way to choke all the wells with the rubbish of Rabbinical theology, and part of Christ’s mission was to remove the rubbish, and restore the intuition of the perennial sense of the Holy Writings.

More of the words and deeds of Jesus than we know may really have belonged originally to the synagogue ministry, though the connection is not indicated in the evangelic records. Some have tried to construct an inaugural synagogue discourse out of materials now forming part of Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount, piecing together, *e.g.*, the counsel against care, the lesson on prayer, the warning against judging, the law of reciprocity, and the closing parable of the wise and foolish builders, and offering the composition as a sample of what Jesus was likely to say in a *concio ad populum*.¹ This is purely conjectural, and not very probable conjecture either; for what we have been accustomed to call the *Sermon* on the Mount is in all probability rather a summary of *disciple-teaching* on various topics carried on perhaps for a week, during a season of retreat on the mountain plateau overlooking

¹ So Keim in his well-known work on the Life of Jesus.

the Galilæan lake. We have something more to support the supposition that certain parables in the evangelic collections, and some also of the recorded miracles had their primary place in the syngague ministry. Luke gives the parables of *the Grain of Mustard Seed* and *the Leaven* as pendants to a syngague incident,¹ suggesting the inference that they were spoken in a syngague discourse. They happily illustrate a truth not too recondite for popular apprehension: that great things may grow out of very insignificant beginnings; and by their simplicity and brevity are well fitted for preaching to the million. The same remark applies to another couplet of parables, that of the Hidden Treasure and the Precious Pearl.² The one pair of parables would aptly clinch the moral of an address whose import was: despise not the kingdom I bring nigh to you because it seems a small, humble thing; the other with equal felicity would enforce the lesson: count the kingdom the chief good, joyfully secure it at all costs. That Jesus did use similitudes in these popular addresses may be taken for granted. "Without a parable spake He not unto them," observes Mark, with reference to our Lord's manner of speaking to the multitude.³ How could He fail to employ that method of instruction, having personally such a taste and talent for it, speaking to people accustomed to it, and knowing full well the power of the parables to entertain, to lodge truth permanently in the mind, and to make truth clear? To make truth clear, I say, for undoubtedly that was the real aim of the parabolic method, not, as one might hastily infer from certain words reported by Mark as spoken by Jesus in connection with the parable of *the Sower*, to hide truth from the eyes of the people, and tickle their ears with words to which they attached

¹ Luke xiii. 18-21.

² Matt. xiii. 31-33.

³ Mark iv. 34.

no rational meaning.¹ Of such an inhuman purpose Jesus was (need it be said?) utterly incapable.

Two miracles certainly, and one most probably, belong to the synagogue ministry. The first of the three is the cure of the demoniac in the synagogue of Capernaum, reported by Mark and Luke;² the second is the cure of the woman who had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, reported by Luke only,³ and the third is the cure of the leper, reported by all the three Synoptical Evangelists.⁴ Mark brings it in immediately after his general statement concerning the preaching of Jesus in the synagogues of Galilee, and the inference is natural that it owes its place to its being regarded by the evangelist as an anecdote of that ministry. In point of varied interest the last-mentioned healing act eclipses the other two, especially as reported by Mark, whose version of the leper-story is a good instance of his realism. Common to all the three narratives is the leper's "If Thou wilt, Thou canst," and Christ's peremptory injunction to the healed man, "Go, show thyself to the priest." Both features are interesting: the former as showing how completely even at this early period faith in Christ's *power* to heal any form of disease had taken hold of the popular mind, and how the more difficult faith in His loving *will* lagged behind; the latter as evincing a desire on Christ's part at once to make the benefit complete by adding to the physical cure social restoration, and to act in a respectful, conciliatory spirit towards existing institutions and established authority. That recognition of the priest's place and function gains added meaning if, as I have supposed, Jesus already feared the interference of the scribes. It assumes in that case the aspect of a policy of conciliation adopted in the interest

¹ Mark iv. 12.

² Mark i. 21-28; Luke iv. 31-37.

³ Luke xiii. 10-13.

⁴ Matt. viii. 2-4; Mark i. 40-45; Luke v. 12-16.

of the mission, in hope to make a favourable impression on synagogue magnates and retain their good-will as long as possible.

To these common elements of the story Mark adds the compassion of Jesus, and the assumption after the cure of an imperative, threatening manner to insure that the healed man shall go away at once and report himself to the priest, instead of remaining content with merely being whole. The addition of these traits is not an affair of mere word-painting. Both are valuable contributions to a vivid reproduction of the situation as observed by an eye-witness. Christ's compassion was a very noticeable feature to an impressionable onlooker like Peter, and one cannot wonder that he laid emphasis on it in reporting the incident. The pity of Jesus is a commonplace to us, but it was not such to the Galilæan villagers. It takes men little accustomed to anything in the world but callous indifference towards other people's woes some time to believe in exceptional, unique, phenomenal love like that of Jesus. They can more easily believe in miraculous *power* than in miraculous *love*. They are able to say "Thou canst," before they are able to say "Thou wilt." Mark's addition, therefore, only shows that he understood perfectly the situation, or, at least, that he is a faithful reporter of the words of one who did. The other particular peculiar to Mark is equally deserving of appreciation. It reveals another phase of Christ's love, in which it puts on an aspect of anger in its determination that the healed leper shall get the whole and not merely the half of the possible benefit. Jesus frowns, speaks imperatively and impatiently, and even thrusts the man out as it were by the shoulders, with an order to go at once. How life-like! how beautiful this subtle play of feeling, this sudden transition from one mood of love to another; from pity to impatience, from the softly spoken "I will" to the masterful "thou must"!

What now was the *result* of this ministry whereof so

scanty a crop of incidents has been preserved to us? It may be stated in a sentence: great temporary popularity, little permanent fruit. Of the popularity we find a trace even in the descriptions of the crowds that afterwards gathered around Jesus. Matthew follows up his general account of the synagogue ministry with a brief notice of the rising tide of enthusiasm in which Galilee occupies a prominent place. "There followed Him great multitudes of people *from Galilee*, and Decapolis, and Jerusalem, and Judæa, and from beyond Jordan."¹ In the corresponding statement of Mark, Galilee is even more pointedly indicated as the main contributor to the vast assembly. The second Evangelist distinguishes two crowds, a very large one coming from Galilee, and a considerable but by no means so great one coming from various other parts. What he says is this: "A *great* multitude from *Galilee* followed; and from Judæa, and from Jerusalem, and from Idumæa, and beyond Jordan, and about Tyre and Sidon, a multitude *great*"²—the epithet "great" following the noun in the second case, as if to say: "large also, but not so large." Galilee sends a larger contingent than all the rest of the country. This is what the synagogue sermons and the cures have come to. The Galilæans cannot part with the Preacher and Healer. They are as unwilling to lose Him as were the people of Capernaum when He suddenly left them after that memorable Sabbath evening. Therefore they followed Him in vast numbers from the various towns He had visited, crowding around Him, jostling Him, knocking against Him, in hope even in that rude way to obtain a cure for their ailments,³ insomuch that it was necessary to have a boat in readiness wherewith to escape sea-wards in case the pressure became utterly unbearable.⁴

Altogether a phenomenal popularity; yet, Jesus Himself

¹ Matt. iv. 25.

² Mark iii. 7, 8.

³ Mark iii. 10.

⁴ Mark iii. 9.

being witness, the abiding spiritual outcome seems to have been inconsiderable. The evidence for this is two-fold: the parable of *the Sower*,¹ and the complaint against the three cities, Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum.² The parable is in reality a critical review of Christ's past Galilæan ministry. Probably all the parables spoken from the boat on the day on which *the Sower* was uttered were of this character, though Matthew's collection contains some of a different type. Jesus was in the mood to tell the people who followed Him and admired Him what He thought of them, and what value He set on their discipleship. His estimate as given in *the Sower* is very depressing. In effect it amounts to this: much seed sown, little fruit. The word of the kingdom, that is to say, scattered with a free hand in the synagogues of Galilee, and, for one reason or another, in most instances no crop visible after sufficient time had elapsed to test the movement by results. The parable hints at some of the reasons of this unfruitfulness in its description of the various sorts of ground on which the seed chanced to fall. The beaten footpath, the shallow soil—a thin layer of earth on a bed of rock—and the land foul with seeds or roots of thorns, represent types of men with whom all religious teachers are familiar: the thoughtless, the superficial, and the men who are not destitute of mental power or spiritual depth but whose great lack is purity and singleness of heart. There were men in Galilee answering to all these types; some with whom the Preacher had not a chance, some on whom He soon and easily made an impression, some whose capacity and seriousness gave promise of something more than temporary interest, even of permanent discipleship, yet destined to disappoint expectation through lack of moral simplicity. The fewest were those whose minds resembled a soil at once soft, deep, and clean: men of honest and good hearts, sincerely regarding the kingdom of God as the chief

¹ Matt. xiii. 3; Mark iv. 3; Luke viii. 4. ² Matt. xi. 20; Luke x. 13.

end, and seeking it with generous devotion. It was altogether a disenchanting, bitter experience. It made Jesus feel, like the prophet Isaiah, as if He had been sent to the synagogues of Galilee not for recovery of sight by the blind, and of hearing by the deaf, but rather to make blind men blinder, and deaf men deafer than ever—as if this were the chief effect of His preaching as a whole, and of the parabolic pictures in particular, with which His addresses were enriched, and which seemed to His hearers their main attraction. If intention were to be judged by result, one might say that Jesus had gone on that preaching tour for the very purpose of shutting eyes and ears; but of course that would be a grievous, fatal misunderstanding of His spirit.

The disappointment connected with the synagogue ministry led to a change in the plan of Jesus. He resolved, henceforth, to devote more attention to the select few who showed intellectual and spiritual capacity for discipleship. From the great multitude he chose a limited number of susceptible hearers, and from these again an inner circle of twelve. In this small field He hoped in due season to reap a rich harvest of thirty, sixty, and an hundred fold.

The complaint against the Galilæan towns is informing as well as saddening. It gives us a momentary glimpse of an extensive ministry whereof very scanty memorials have been preserved. Chorazin, one of the towns named, is nowhere mentioned except in this reproachful word. It is supposed to have been situated on the highway to Tyre from Capernaum on the western side of the upper Jordan. It was, doubtless, one of the many towns Jesus visited in connection with His synagogue ministry, where He had not only preached but wrought some remarkable cures. For another thing noticeable in this complaint is that the emphasis of its lament lies not on fruitless preaching, but rather on fruitless *mighty works*. From this we learn that

healing acts, often remarkable, like the cure of the leper, were a common if not constant accompaniment of the preaching ministry in Galilee. We are not to suppose, however, that Jesus Himself laid chief stress on them. He looks at the matter from the point of view of His Galilæan hearers. He is aware that what they most admired and valued was the cures wrought on the sick, and what He says of them and to them is, in effect, this : "Ye heard Me in your synagogues, and, what is more important in your eyes, ye saw My works with astonishment and thankfulness at the time. And what has been the result? No change in spirit or in life: ye remain as ye were, as thoughtless, shallow, and preoccupied as ever." "They repented not."

No change noticeable in the life of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, selected to represent the many Galilæan cities visited in connection with the synagogue ministry—such is the melancholy verdict of the Preacher. The reference to Tyre and Sidon suggests that these three towns are named not merely because they had been exceptionally privileged, but because of their *commercial importance*. If so, then we get this result, that the commercial section of Jewish society was as inappreciative in its attitude towards Jesus as the religious section. Differing widely on the surface, they were at one in this, that neither sought the kingdom of God and the righteousness of God as the chief good of life.

Truly a sad account of a people with such a spiritual history behind it. How depressing to think that One anointed by the Spirit of the Father for an evangelistic mission should have no better report to give at the close! Alas! it is more or less the report and the burden of all high ministries in this world! Yet it is best not to say too much about it, or to brood over it, or to allow ourselves to be driven into pessimism by it. Keep cheerful and hopeful

always, and preach a real, acceptable gospel, telling men not merely that iniquities prevail against them, but that as for their transgressions God can and will purge them away. There is quite enough pessimism in the world without bringing it into the pulpit. Surely it is out of place there! And what good can it do? Men are saved by hope, not by despair; and if the preacher would make others hope, he must be hopeful himself. In spite of all disappointment, go on speaking sweetly and reasonably, now and then embodying truth in a parable, and leave the word to work like a charm. If that way fails, nothing else will succeed. So Jesus continued to do His work, while occasionally making His complaint. He was no pessimist. He was simply, as has been remarked, the one great religious Optimist who cannot be accused of shallowness, or of shutting His eyes to the evil that is in the world.

It is an interesting question in what relation the mission of the twelve disciples stood to the synagogue ministry of their Master. It may have been intended in part to supplement it by spreading the good news in Galilee more completely than Jesus had been able to do. But the mission of the disciples was not to preach in the *synagogues*: for that they were not yet fit. Theirs was a *house* ministry, not a *synagogue* ministry. They were to enter into the houses of such as were willing to receive them, and to stay there as long as they remained in any particular place, talking to the family and to such neighbours as dropped in concerning the Kingdom and its King. Of the kingdom they could say little beyond the most elementary statement of God's good-will to the penitent, but concerning the King they would have more to tell. Probably the main part of their conversation consisted of anecdotes about their Master, recollections of what He had said or done during His preaching tour; now a parable, anon a healing act reported for the entertainment and benefit of their hearers.

Such communications would in most cases insure for them a welcome, though in His instructions to the apprentice missionaries Jesus contemplated the possibility of an opposite reception: "Whosoever shall not receive you."¹ The words may express a fear suggested by personal experience of work frustrated or interrupted by religious prejudice in His own early effort to evangelise Galilee.

A. B. BRUCE.

THE GREAT COMMANDMENT.

(MARK XII. 28-34.)

BOTH in Matthew and Mark the question put to Jesus as to the great commandment in the law is connected with the repulse of the Sadducees. The first Evangelist represents the whole transaction in a less favourable light than the second. We infer from Matthew's narrative that the Pharisees hoped to succeed where the rival party had failed, and that the lawyer who put the question to Jesus did so in order to tempt Him, and that in pursuance of a plan deliberately formed at a Pharisaic meeting. "When they heard that He had put the Sadducees to silence, they gathered themselves together. And one of them, a lawyer, put a question to Him, tempting Him." The question was one constantly discussed in the schools, and no doubt, as Weiss says, they hoped, with the resources of their casuistical dialectic, to bewilder and confound the layman who ventured, in the simplicity of his heart, to give any straightforward answer. And in effect, in Matthew, Jesus does not give a direct answer. He is asked of what nature a commandment must be to be great in the law, but He declines to make distinctions in that which is throughout the will of God. He repeats two commandments, the significance of which does not belong to them as distinct from others,

¹ *Matt. x. 14.*

but consists precisely in this, that they include all the rest. "On these two commandments hangeth the whole law, and the prophets." They are great because they summarily comprehend the whole will of God.

In Mark the same event is narrated, but under a different light. The questioner is the same, a scribe or lawyer; but he is moved rather by admiration of the noble answer Jesus had given to the Sadducees than by any hostile purpose. Alike in what he says and in what Jesus says of him we get the impression of a man who was too good for his society, whose soul hungered for something better than the moral pedantry of the Jewish schools, and who longed for deliverance from the bondage of the letter into some kind of spiritual freedom. Like others of his profession, he had no doubt enumerated the commandments of the Old Testament, and discussed which should take precedence of which; but as long as there is a spark of religion in the soul this atomistic morality is profoundly unsatisfying, and the scribe who came to Jesus was feeling his way out of it. "What kind of commandment," he asked, "is greatest of all?" The "all" is neuter, not feminine like "commandment"; the scribe wishes to know that quality in a commandment which entitles it to an absolute precedence: in other words, which makes it, not an item in a code, but the principle of the code. "Jesus answered, The first is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God, the Lord is one: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength."

Probably the first thing which struck the scribe when he heard the words was their familiarity. Jesus may have pointed as He spoke to the phylacteries in which he carried them on his person at the moment. He had repeated them night and morning ever since he could remember. They remind us that the most important truths in religion are as a rule the best known, and that the first lessons of a religious

education have that in them which we never need to outgrow. If a man has learned the twenty-third Psalm in childhood, can he ever want a more perfect expression of faith in God? If he has been taught to say the Lord's Prayer, can he ever require a prayer which covers more? One great advantage of a religious education is, that the soul discovers, in the experience of life, that it is the possessor of unexpected resources; it does not need to climb heaven or cross the sea for the truth or the guidance it requires: the word is very nigh, in the mouth and in the heart.

The commandment which Jesus cites to the scribe is peculiar to revealed religion. That is only to say, in other words, that it presupposes redemption. We could not imagine such a precept in the religion of Greece or of Rome, and of course we do not find it. Who could "love," in any conceivable sense of the word, Zeus or Poseidon, Hêrê or Athênê? Neither the place they hold in the universe, nor their characters and relations to each other, nor their attitude to men, inspire any such emotion. It is often said that love cannot be commanded, but that has only a limited truth. Granted certain relations between persons, and love is demanded by the very nature of the case; if it is wanting, its absence is the gravest of moral faults, and brings innumerable others in its train; till it comes, literally nothing can be right. This is the situation which is assumed to exist where God and Israel are in question. It is not as though they were nothing to each other. God is the God of Israel, and Israel is the people of God. The "thou" in Deuteronomy vi. 5 is of course collective; it is the nation as a whole which is addressed, and from which this hearty devotion to God is required; but there was no difficulty in applying it to the individual case. The Israelites knew what God was, and what He had done for His people. They knew that the inheritance into which they entered in

virtue of their birth had been prepared for them by Him. They knew that at the head of all commandments stood the name and title of the Redeemer: I am Jehovah thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. They knew that He had been the dwelling-place of Israel in all generations, and that long before any earthly love His love had thought of them and blessed them. Their history was the history of God's mercy and faithfulness; wherever they looked, His loving-kindness was before their eyes; to love Him was the ever-present duty, the first, the last, the most urgent of all.

It is for the same reason that this commandment retains its significance in the New Testament. Love to God is still the first of duties, because it is the one thing which answers to the relation which has been revealed in Christ as existing between God and man. Christians have a knowledge of God going beyond that possessed by Israel, and all in our knowledge which surpasses theirs is but a new enforcement of this precept. Can any one believe in the Incarnation and the Atonement, and be in doubt about the duty which comprehends all others? Can any one believe that God Himself has condescended to dwell among us in the person of His Son, that He has worn our nature, shared our experiences, borne "the strain of the problem our sins had created," given His life a ransom for us, and yet cavil at the idea of making love to Him a duty? If it is not a duty, it can only be because it is a passion, and yet it is as a passion that men are most apt to dispute its right to take God for its object. But what do we find in the New Testament, the only place in which we see Christian life in its original and most characteristic form? If we find anything, it is love to God raised to passionate intensity and made the first law of life. It is souls that vibrate with the thought of what God has done for them in His Son, and respond to it with an ardour that glows across those nineteen hundred

years. We might almost say that in Old Testament times the great commandment was never kept: the motives which alone could constrain so unspiritual and refractory a thing as the human heart had not yet been brought to bear upon it. The psalmists who say, "I love the Lord," knew something of Him, and made some response; but they did not know what Paul knew when he said, "The love of Christ constraineth us"; nor what John knew when he wrote, "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins. . . . We love, because He first loved us." The central truths of the Christian revelation must keep their central place if the great commandment is to have that fulfilment in the modern Church which it had in Peter and Paul and John. Our love is ever a response, a response to an irresistible constraint, and that constraint is exercised only through the Cross.

Of all commandments, love to God is that which most perfectly combines law and liberty. If we love Him at all, we wish to love Him more; we feel that all we are capable of in this kind is for ever too little. Hence it is not the voice of the Lawgiver only, but of our own spirits also, which says, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God "with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength." The true religion, the supremely great commandment, appeals to all that is within us; it calls our whole nature into play. This is why, though exacting, it is not grievous. It commands us to do what we instinctively long to do. The soul is fettered till it can thus love, and to love thus would be its emancipation. In truth, our being is only raised to its height as it comes under the inspiration of God's love and begins to respond to it. We look eagerly in young converts for a blossoming of the whole nature, an expansion of intelligence, an awakening of affection, an abundant entering into a new

and larger life. Only God can evoke the latent powers of heart and strength and mind; and no one knows of what he is capable, in thought, feeling, or character, till he has begun to obey the first commandment of all.

The scribe had only asked one question, but Jesus gives a twofold answer. To the first commandment He annexes a second, also in familiar Old Testament words: "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." Luke represents a lawyer, who came to Jesus tempting Him, as quibbling over the word "neighbour" in this sentence, and being answered in the parable of the Good Samaritan. But an honest mind would find no difficulty, and none is made on the present occasion. The second commandment, we ought to remember, is really the second; though it is enunciated side by side with the first, it is not strictly co-ordinate with it. It is in God that men are related to each other, all men are so related, and it is through Him that their duties to each other are determined. Yet the connection between God and man is so close that the two commandments are in a true sense one, and obedience to either may be made a test of obedience to the other. The man who does not love God cannot know what man is to God, and therefore cannot love man either as the law of God requires; and the man who does not love his brother makes a false claim when he professes to love God. For all practical purposes, therefore—for all such purposes as a commandment has in view—God and man exist in each other, and the duties we owe in either relation can neither be seen nor discharged if the other is allowed to fall out of view. Kant's supreme ethical maxim is always to treat humanity, both in yourself and in others, as an end, not a means: in the language of the New Testament, we should rather say, Always treat humanity, both in yourself and in others, as what it is to God. Recognise under all circumstances, first and foremost, that which is of God in your neighbour—

God's interest in him, God's hope of him, the rights which God has given him both in this life and beyond. Regard him always as invested in these, and you will have the only key to your duty towards him. God loves my neighbour exactly as He loves me : whatever may distinguish us, we have all one Father. Even if I hate my neighbour, God loves him, and the sum of all my duties towards him is unchangeably determined by that fact. I am bound, at whatever cost, to guard and to further God's interest in him. If I decline to do so, I renounce both the commandments at once. That is the meaning and application of the two in combination—the law and the prophets in one word. What love means is also to be determined from this point of view. Care for that which is of God in us may sometimes require us to be severe to ourselves. In corresponding circumstances there would be the same call for love to be severe to others. We distinguish almost unconsciously between love and severity ; but the only ground on which these two commandments, which mutually interpret and support each other, can maintain the primacy here assigned them, is that the love which they prescribe shall be a universal principle—a spirit capable of developing and using resources and tempers of every kind, of exercising both judgment and mercy.

It seems an obvious inference from the words of Jesus in this place that the distinction between religion and morality is only half real. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart"—that is religion. "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"—that is morality. Yet Jesus cannot speak of the one apart from the other, any more than in His own life He could actually have separated the one from the other. His own perfect love of the Father was expressed in an infinite devotion to the human race and to the Father's purpose for it ; and that devotion itself took all its character and derived all its power from

His perfect knowledge of God and unreserved obedience to Him. This is the essential and permanent relation of the two things, to speak of them as two. Love to God, or religion, is primary ; love to man, or morality, is secondary. Neither has any reality apart from the other ; but the conception of God—through whom alone men are related to each other, and without whom they are as moral atoms to whom no common duty is owing—is that which determines the mutual obligations of men ; in other words, morality is determined by religion. The first commandment must not be discarded as transcendent in order to give more room and more emphasis to the second. When the first has disappeared the second has lost both its basis and its contents. For no abstract conception of “humanity” can be a principle of unity and of obligation like the living God, the Father and Redeemer of men.

The scribe showed a hearty appreciation of our Lord's answer to his question. The *καλῶς* of *v.* 32 brings back the admiration already referred to in *v.* 28. What he felt when he heard Jesus' answer to the Sadducees he now frankly expressed : “Of a truth, Master, Thou hast well said that He is one, and there is none other but He ; and to love Him with all the heart and with all the understanding and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is much more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.” They were standing in the Temple courts as he spoke. The altar was there—the centre of immemorial devotion, the place of costly and reverent sacrifice ; it was there the praises of Israel ascended, on which Jehovah was enthroned. But to keep these two commandments was better than all ; no worship could be so great as this love. The scribe answered as a man lifted above himself, and carried away by his instinctive sympathy with Jesus. And while his soul yet vibrated to the great words, Jesus, seeing that he answered

prudently, said to him, "Thou art not far from the kingdom of God."

A moment of suspense like this, face to face with Jesus, is a singular but not a very rare experience. Most people have said to themselves, after some word of Jesus: "Yes, this truly is salvation; this is life eternal; this is unquestionably the one thing needful and incomparable." The heart, perhaps taken at unawares, perhaps in deliberate, sober seriousness, confesses that with Jesus is the secret of life, and that it is made for His kingdom. What insight one may have, yet what power to arrest action answering to it! What a capacity for sympathy with the Divine, nay, what an experience of it one may have, and yet after all only stand inconsequently admiring, instead of entering into, the kingdom! How can we get past this perilous place? How, but by receiving into our souls that love of God which will evoke in us an answer of love, in which all our heart and strength and mind will become His? This is the religion which asserts itself in the only perfect morality, and which fulfils the whole will of God for man. At the very best, to do the other commandments, but ignore the first, is to seek a righteousness of works—an endless and futile task; but to begin where Jesus bids us begin, under the inspiration of that love of God which is revealed in Him, is to follow the righteousness of life. When we catch a glimpse of the length and breadth and depth and height of this answer of Jesus, we do not wonder that no man after this ventured to ask Him any further question.

JAMES DENNEY.

JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK, AND LUKE.

V. THE MISSION TO THE PUBLICANS.

OF this part of our Lord's work, not less than of the synagogue-ministry, the ordinary reader of the Gospels has a most inadequate idea. It amounts to this, that Jesus happened on one occasion to be present as a guest at a social entertainment given by one of His disciples, named Matthew or Levi, to associates of the publican class to which he had himself previously belonged, and being present, ate with them without hesitation, and doubtless also addressed to His fellow-guests some gracious words, indicating that the door of the Kingdom was open even to them. Not a few careful students of the Evangelic Records have been content with this meagre conception. Yet if we could only shake off the trammels of custom, so as to be able to take a fresh view of the matter, a little reflection would suffice to convince us that what has just been stated cannot be the whole truth or even the principal part of it. From the nature of the case Jesus cannot have been merely passive in the matter, in the sense in which persons invited to an ordinary festive gathering are passive, each one going because he has received an invitation from the host, and without knowing whom he is to meet. The newly called disciple would not have ventured to invite his Master to eat with *publicans* without first ascertaining that He was willing to meet them. Nay, one may go further, and say that the publican-disciple would never have thought or hinted at such a meeting unless he had been given to understand that the Master

was not only willing but desirous to have social intercourse with the outcast classes of Capernaum. The initiative must really have been with Jesus. The whole plan must have been His. He must have had in His mind a deliberate intention to come into close fraternal contact with the "publicans and sinners." Of this design the Evangelists say nothing; they simply report very briefly the main events: Matthew's call and the ensuing feast. But once we have got the idea of such a design into our minds, we recognise in these two events simply the working out of the plan—the method employed by Jesus to give effect to His gracious purpose. First He calls to discipleship a *publican*, doubtless with a view to ulterior service as an apostle, but likewise with a view to immediate service as an intermediary between Himself and the publicans of Capernaum. Then, through Matthew as His agent, He calls together the class to which the new disciple belonged, that He may eat with them and speak to them the good news of the Kingdom.¹

That Jesus would entertain such a plan was to be expected. We have seen how much in earnest he was about a systematic synagogue-ministry. But His earnestness was not one-sided. He desired to do His duty as the Herald of the Kingdom, impartially, to all classes of Jewish society. In this connection we may distinguish four classes. First, the religious leaders of Israel; secondly, the respectable synagogue-frequenting body of the people; thirdly, the hidden minority of devout men and women who had spiritual affinity for the New Teaching; lastly, the social pariahs. Now that Jesus performed the function called for in reference to the first three of these four classes, is sufficiently evident from the Gospels. He criticised faithfully and thoroughly scribes and Pharisees, that being what they needed. He went the round of the synagogues of Galilee

¹ *Matt.* ix. 9-13; *Mark* ii. 13-17; *Luke* v. 27-32.

and preached in them in turn, at least in as many of them as possible. He was constantly on the outlook for persons of special spiritual susceptibility and promise, and gradually formed them into a disciple-circle for the purpose of careful instruction. In view of these familiar facts, who can doubt that He did not neglect the lowest pariah class, that He was equally conscientious and thorough in regard to them, that He cared for their spiritual interest in no casual, haphazard, or half-hearted way, but systematically, persistently, and very cordially? Neglect the publicans! One would say that, whatever class was to be overlooked, it would not be they. Neglect the "sinners," neglect the neglected and despised! Impossible for such a one as Jesus.

It might be supposed, however, that there was no need for a special mission to the "publicans and sinners," that their interests would be sufficiently provided for, *e.g.*, by the synagogue-ministry. But the fact was not so. The publicans were practically, if not formally, excommunicated. They were as heathens in the esteem of religious Jews. A learned writer on this subject states that publicans were not reckoned in religious society, quoting from the Talmud words to this effect: a religious person who becomes a publican must be driven out of religious company.¹ "No money known to come from them was received into the alms-box of the synagogue or the corban of the Temple."² Such being the state of feeling, it is evident that few if any publicans would have an opportunity of hearing any of Christ's synagogue discourses. They would probably not have been admitted even if they had sought entrance, and they were not likely to do that, for men all the world over avoid places of worship when they know they are not welcome. There was just one chance for the publicans.

¹ Otho, *Lexicon Rabbinico-philologicum*, p. 556.

² Article "Publican," in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible.

They might join the crowds that gathered about Jesus wherever He went, and get the benefit of His open-air preaching. That they seem to have done to some extent, for in his report of Levi's feast Mark states that they (the publicans) were many, and that they followed Jesus.¹ That was so far well. It might content the publicans, but it would not content the sinners' Friend. He would desire closer contact and more direct intercourse. In the interest they were showing He saw His opportunity, and Matthew's call and the feast following were the result.

In the development of His plans our Lord followed the leadings of Providence. He began with a synagogue-ministry, because, as that depended on the good-will of others, it was important that it should be started at once and pushed on vigorously before the suspicions of the scribes were aroused. The mission to the publicans was undertaken after the return to Capernaum from the preaching tour in the synagogues of Galilee. It was the natural second step. They were a class whom the synagogue-ministry, for reasons already indicated, had not reached, and their presence in the crowds that followed Jesus along the lake-shore showed that they were not beyond reach. An evangelising experiment among them was worth trying. So Matthew was called, and through him the festive gathering convened. The publican-disciple was ready to respond, and his call would immediately create expectation. It would at once be felt that He who took that bold step meant to do more. An event was impending that would create a sensation.

It was a great event. That is plainly indicated by all the three Evangelists; but readers of the narratives, pre-occupied with the notion of a private dinner party, readily fail to notice the fact. In each of the reports it is distinctly stated that "many" were present. That itself ought to

¹ Mark ii. 15.

open our eyes to the significance of the occasion, and make us think of a *congregation* embracing hundreds, rather than of a private entertainment to say a score of guests; meeting not in the dining chamber of a house, but in the large open court around which the apartments of an Eastern house are built.¹

Of course it was not a merely *festive* gathering. To eat and drink was not the sole or even the chief end of the meeting. Jesus from the first meant to speak to that remarkable assembly of social pariahs and moral non-descripts. The eating was subservient to that as the ultimate aim, a means of establishing cordial relations between Speaker and hearers, and opening a way for His message into their hearts. But in that respect it was all-important; hence the prominence given to it in the narratives. The Evangelists say nothing about the speaking; that they take for granted. They assume it will be understood by all their readers that Jesus would not meet with such a large company, and especially with a company of so peculiar a quality, without having something memorable and uniquely impressive to say to them concerning the Kingdom. As a matter of course He would tell them the good news of God. As a matter of course accordingly it is treated, a thing not needing to be mentioned. But of the eating careful note is taken, and for an obvious reason. It was the speciality, the thing that would create surprise on all sides—in fellow-guests and in outsiders; the thing that was sure to be extensively talked about and that would inevitably make a powerful impression of one sort or another, winning publicans, shocking scribes and Pharisees. In giving such prominence to the social aspect of the function the Evangelists only show their full comprehension and appreciation of the situation.

¹ Furrer, author of a delightful book on Palestine (*Wanderungen durch das heilige Land*) assumes as a matter of course that the meeting took place there.

The thing of importance to note, however, is that Jesus understood the situation. He knew perfectly what He was doing. He knew that His line of action would create scandal and in all likelihood provoke malevolent misconstruction. But He felt that He must take the risk. He knew that no half-measures would do with the people He was trying to benefit. He must either be their friend, their comrade, out and out, or let them alone. If He could not, or would not, eat with them, out of a regard to social proprieties, the instinctive swift inference of the classes concerned would be : "He too is at heart a Pharisee. He cares a little for us, mildly pities us, would like to talk to us about religion ; but He dare not sit down at the same table with us ; He fears the censure of the virtuous, the tongue of the pious, the frown of those that pass for good." All this Jesus clearly perceived ; therefore He pursued the policy of radical, fearless, thorough-going, comradeship. But He did not so act *from* policy. He acted spontaneously, without calculation, and without effort, at the bidding of a loving heart. *Phenomenal miraculous love* was at the bottom of the whole proceeding. Mere wisdom would not have been equal to the emergency. Nothing but love unexampled in Capernaum or anywhere else could have had the originality to conceive the plan, the courage to adopt it, and the tact to carry it through. What cares such love for conventional proprieties or evil tongues ? It leaps the fence, however high ; it overflows the most carefully constructed embankments of social custom ; it will have its way, and it is prepared to take the consequences.

Sure enough there were consequences to be reckoned with. That also the Evangelists are careful to record. He is a very simple man who fancies that he can indulge in the moral originality of Jesus, taking counsel only with love, and escape unpleasant consequences. All things new and original, in thought, and still more in action, are inevitably

blamed. The best things, before men get accustomed to them, are treated as if they were the worst. So it came to pass that the conduct of Jesus provoked the question, "Why eateth your Master with the publicans and sinners?" Nor was that the end or the worst of the matter. It came at last to hideous, horrible calumny. They said in effect: He associates with the reprobates because He is a reprobate: a drunkard, a glutton, and what not.¹

So deplorable a result almost tempts the question: Was that well-meant movement not after all a mistake? Has a man any right to throw away his good name in trying to do good to others? This is a question of casuistry that is not likely often to arise, for few have love enough to expose them to any danger. If any one feels inclined to raise the question in connection with our Lord's action in reference to the publicans, it will be well that he first of all make an effort to understand the alternatives. There were, as has been already hinted, only two courses open: either to go the full length in comradeship or to let the publicans and sinners alone. A middle course in the circumstances was not possible. Therefore, taking care of His good name would have simply meant for Jesus treating the outcasts with the usual indifference. Now once for all that was simply impossible for Him. The one thing He could not do was to let people alone in their sin and misery. Surely a noble, honourable, blessed inability! And observe what the let-alone policy would have involved. It could not be limited to the case of the publicans; it must be carried through. If Jesus must neglect them to save His good name, how much more He would have to neglect! He would have to shun the *cross* to escape the shame. And what would that have come to? Saving Himself and failing to save others. Nay, failing ultimately even to save

¹ *Matt. xi. 19.*

Himself. If Jesus Christ had made it His chief business to adapt His conduct to local and contemporary ideas, instead of being the Saviour of the world He would have been a Nobody. That is the penalty men pay who are too desirous to please their own time. In their anxiety to conciliate the prejudices of to-day they do nothing for the future, and are soon forgotten.

In the Capernaum movement in behalf of the publicans Jesus emphatically worked for the future. No part of His public ministry possesses a deeper or more abiding significance. As a revelation of His spirit and a promise of great things to come, it stands on a much higher level than the synagogue-ministry. That was a good work which had to be done sometime, and which was most fitly done at the commencement. But in it the activity of our Lord ran in the channel of a purely Jewish institution. The new wine was put into an old vessel. In that preaching tour among the synagogues of Galilee Jesus was simply a Minister of God to Israel. But in the mission to the publicans it was otherwise. The new wine was put into a new vessel. The new spirit found for itself at once a new sphere and a new method of working. Jesus then began to be a Servant of the Kingdom for the *world*. To the Jew a publican was as a heathen man. He is entitled to the honour as well as the dishonour of that identification, and to be regarded as the representative of the Gentiles. The Capernaum movement was the forerunner of Gentile Christianity. A man of prophetic vision watching its progress might have said: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life."

There was more than universalism latent in that mission. It was the cradle of Christian civilisation, which has for its goal a humanised society from whose rights and privileges no class shall be hopelessly and finally excluded. It was a protest in the name of God, who made of one blood all the nations and classes, against all artificial or superficial

cleavages of race, colour, descent, occupation, or even of character, as of small account in comparison with that which is common to all—the human soul, with its grand, solemn possibilities. It was an appeal to the conscience of the world to put an end to barbarous alienations and heartless neglects, and social ostracisms, cruelties, and tyrannies; so making way for a brotherhood in which “sinners,” “publicans,” and “Pharisees” should recognise one another as fellow-men and as sons of the one Father in heaven.

But it may be asked: If that movement was so important, why did the Evangelists give so inadequate an account of it? why, above all, did they not report what Jesus said on the occasion, which must have been extremely well worth recording, both in substance and in form? I will deal with this complaint before I am done, but meantime I remark that such as lament the lack ought at least to make the most of what the Evangelists have actually given us. They report one word Christ uttered on this occasion on no account to be overlooked; not spoken indeed to the publicans, but to men who blamed Him for associating with them. It is: “They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick: I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.” The saying consists of two parts, each of which serves a distinct purpose. The first part recognises the claims of the weak on the strong; the second proclaims a policy pursued in the interest of the Divine Kingdom. “Sinners,” therefore, to be shunned you think? Nay, that is just the reason why they should be sought after, as it is the sick whom the physician visits. Sinners, therefore, not worth caring about? Nay, to care for them is not only a duty imposed by love, but a policy dictated by wisdom. Of just such as these recovered from the error of their ways is the Kingdom of Heaven, whose best citizens are drawn not from those who pride themselves on their virtue, but from

those who repent of their folly. A commonplace now, thanks to the teaching and example of Christ, but a startling doctrine in an age when it was thought that the one thing a man had to do was to be good himself without trying to make others good, and when it was taken for granted that a man with a mission, the founder of a new religion, the originator of a new society, would gather about him the best people he could find, and form them into a select, exclusive circle of superior persons. The world has cause to thank Jesus Christ that He came to attempt a more heroic task, to gather around Him the erring, the ignorant, the weak, that He might make them temperate, pure, thoughtful, strong. By undertaking this high mission He inaugurated a new era—the era of *grace*.

Returning now to the lament over the unrecorded address, two questions may be asked regarding it: Have we no clue to its drift? Is it quite certain that its most essential part has not been preserved?

1. The *action* of Jesus speaks. It speaks to us; it would speak even more impressively to the publicans and sinners. His presence there as a fellow-guest on equal terms, not as a patron but as a comrade, told its own story. All understood instinctively that religion, God, man, must be something quite different for this new Teacher from what they were for Pharisees and scribes. "He does not hate us; He does not despise us. Holiness for Him does not mean keeping virtuously aloof from the unholy. Bad as we are, He seems to find in us some common element that He can love, some touch of nature that makes us kin, far apart though we be in our ways. In spite of our unpopular occupations and evil deeds, we are still at least men and women to Him, and apparently not without possibilities of becoming good men and good women. What kind of a God can He believe in? Surely not the God of the scribes! The God of the scribes, like the scribes themselves, looks

askance on the like of us. The God of this Teacher must be a kindly Being like Himself,—One who would not be ashamed to be called even *our* God, and who would own us as His children, though men have cast us off.” Such were the thoughts that in the form of dim feeling, if not in distinctly formulated conception, passed through the minds of that motley audience even before Jesus began to speak, suggested by the mere fact of His being there. By eating with them He silently preached a veritable Gospel in a *symbolic sacramental act*.

And when Jesus began to speak, what else could He do than express in word what He had already expressed in deed? His line of thought was dictated by the impression which, as He well understood, His presence was making upon His audience. He could only put into words what was in the mind of all. One needs only to realise the situation to be able to reconstruct the address, at least in outline. It would state in simple language the truth about God and His bearing towards erring men. It would hold out hope of a better future for the worst, declaring that past sin was no inevitable doom, and that by repentance every man might pass from depravity and misery into purity and blessedness. It would strive to cure the doubt latent in every heart in that assembly as to the possibility of either God or man really caring for the like of them, a doubt too well justified by the contemptuous indifference with which they were treated on every hand. “He seems to care for us, else why is He here? But how can it be? What should make Him in this so utterly unlike all other men we have known? And as for God, is it credible He can be like this Man, and so utterly unlike all we have been taught to believe by our religious instructors?” Such was the state of mind with which the Speaker had to reckon; and if He dealt with it after His wonted manner, He would use some happy parable to make the difficult in the

spiritual sphere clear by a familiar story taken from natural life.

2. This brings me to my second question. Is it quite certain that the essential part of the address of Jesus to the publicans has not been preserved? On the contrary, it is highly probable that we ought to discover the kernel of the address in the parables concerning finding things lost contained in the fifteenth chapter of Luke's Gospel. They suit exactly the requirement of the case as above indicated. And from Luke's introductory statement we learn that the parables grew out of a gathering of "publicans and sinners" to hear Jesus, at which He not only spoke to them, but ate with them. This at once suggests the Capernaum assembly as the real historical occasion. True, in Luke's account the parables are represented as spoken not to the publicans, but to the Pharisaic fault-finders. But this fact creates no serious difficulty. In themselves the three parables, in their essential parts, might have been spoken to any audience, to a congregation in a synagogue, to a meeting of social pariahs, to disciples, to Pharisees. They would simply require a little modification to fit them to the particular audience. Quite possibly they were uttered again and again to all sorts of audiences. Matthew gives the first of the three, "the Lost Sheep," as a word spoken to the twelve in the Capernaum lesson on humility.¹ This is perfectly credible. And it is still more credible that not only the first, but the whole three, were spoken to the publicans. No more appropriate audience could be imagined, and no one knew that better than Jesus. It may be matter of regret that they have not come down to us in the form of a sermon to a publican audience. But that the tradition is at fault here is not surprising. The primitive Christian society cared much more for the words of the Master than for the exact historical occasions. Therefore

¹ *Matt.* xviii. 12.

we need not wonder if, in the book of Logia compiled, according to the testimony of Papias, by Matthew, these golden words were faithfully preserved without clear indication of their historical connection. And we have the remedy in our own hands. We are not bound by the connection assigned to them by Luke or by the author of the first Gospel. We can give them the setting that is most fitting, and that brings out their full pathos, and claim them for the festive gathering in the court of the house of Levi, as the core of the address spoken by Jesus that day. It is no sin against true reverence to reproduce them here adapted to the circumstances by needful modification and brief preface.

Jesus, then, may have spoken after this manner :

“Men and women, I love you. I am your Brother. God, my Father and your Father, loves you, and will welcome you returning to Him in penitence. You doubt this ; cannot think it possible. I wonder not, knowing how you have been spurned by your fellow-townsmen. Yet it is simple when you think of it. Your Father in heaven, and I your Brother on earth, only share the joy common to all who find things lost. Hear a parable :

“‘A certain man had a hundred sheep, and having lost one of them, left the ninety and nine in the wilderness and went after that which was lost until he found it. And when he found it he laid it on his shoulders with joy. And when he came home, he told his neighbours, and they were all glad that he had found the lost sheep.’

“Does the joy of the shepherd and his neighbours seem strange to you ? Such joy would I, would my Father in heaven, have in any of you turning from evil to good.

“Not only the owner of a flock of sheep, but the poorest of you may know the joy of finding things lost. Hear another parable :

“ ‘ A certain woman had ten pieces of silver, and lost one of them. She lighted a lamp, swept the house, and sought till she found it. In her joy she told her neighbours, and they all rejoiced with her.’

“Think not there may be joy in the finding of a sheep or a coin, but no joy in finding a lost man. There may be more joy over a *man* found than over the finding of any lost *thing*. Hear yet another parable :

“ ‘ A certain man had two sons, and the younger of them said to his father, Father, give me the portion that falleth to me. And he divided unto them his living. And not many days after the younger son gathered all together, and took his journey into a far country, and there he wasted his substance with riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that country, and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country ; and he sent him into his fields to feed swine. And he longed to eat of the pods which were the swine’s food, and no man gave unto him. But when he came to himself, he said : How many hired servants of my father have bread beyond their need, and I perish here with hunger. I will arise, and go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight. I am no more worthy to be called thy son ; make me as one of thy hired servants. And he arose, and came to his father. And

when he was still at a great distance from home his father saw him, and was touched with pity, and running towards him, he fell on his neck and fervently kissed him. And the son said : Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee : I am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to the servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet, as becometh a son, and bring the fatted calf and kill it, and let us eat and make merry. For this my son was dead and is alive again ; he was lost and is found.' " ¹

When we think of this parable as spoken to the publicans in the house of Levi, we perceive that the festivities of that day explain the parable, and that the parable explains the festivities.

What success Jesus had among the publicans we do not know, though I think that the story of the woman in Simon's house ² may be taken as an illustrative example of the effect produced.

The method of Jesus *deserved* success. Nothing but His deep, unfeigned love, going the whole way, will win men. Patronising philanthropy will not do. Those who practise it have nothing in common with Jesus. "He was no patron ; He never acted in a condescending manner. He was the friend in the most genuine sense, even of publicans and harlots. His Kingdom cannot make progress through patronage, however kindly intentioned." ³

A. B. BRUCE.

¹ The second part of the parable concerning the elder brother relates to the Pharisees.

² *Luke* vii. 36-50.

³ *The Spirit in Literature and in Life*, by Dr. Coyle. Houghton, Mifflin and Company : The Rand Lectures in Iowa, 1894. A thoughtful, suggestive book.

A FIXED DATE IN THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL.

THE extreme importance, and the extreme difficulty, of finding any fixed and certain date in the life of St. Paul are familiar to every student of that period of history. The attempt to get any such fixed date by a synchronism with Roman history, has failed. The proconsulship of Sergius Paulus in Cyprus, and of Gallio in Achaia, the procuratorship of Felix and of Festus in Judæa, are all uncertain in point of chronology. There is, however, one date which, if I am not mistaken, can be fixed not merely to the year, but to the month and day; and yet few of the investigators take much notice of it.¹ For example, it is not even alluded to in Lightfoot's posthumous essay on the *Chronology of St. Paul's Life and Epistles* in his *Biblical Essays*, pp. 215 ff. The reason for this neglect seems to be two-fold: (1) the date depends on a belief in the minute and exact accuracy of Luke's narrative, and there has been a tendency among modern scholars to distrust his accuracy; (2) it gives a scheme of dates earlier by one year than the majority of modern scholars desire or think probable.

The intention of this paper is to concentrate attention and criticism on the evidence of time furnished by the narrative of Acts xx. 5 ff. for the voyage of St. Paul to Jerusalem. In that passage we learn that the Passover was celebrated and the Days of Unleavened Bread were spent in Philippi. Thereafter the company started for Troas; and their voyage continued into the fifth day. In Troas they stayed seven days; the last complete day that they spent there was a Sunday, and they sailed away early on a Monday morning. Now, on the system common in ancient usage and followed by Luke, a part of a day, or of

¹ Wieseler and Lewin recognise its importance; but, as I think, they do not estimate its meaning correctly.

any other unit of time, is always reckoned as a complete unit in making a numerical statement of the duration of any action. The seven days in Troas, then, began with a Tuesday and ended with a Monday. Further, the Tuesday of the arrival in Troas must be also counted as the fifth day of the voyage. The voyage was evidently unusually protracted (contrast xvi. 11 f.); and hence the peculiar and unique expression, "we came until five days,"¹ where the Bezan reviser, according to his usual custom, substitutes the commoner and more easily understood term, "on the fifth day."² The journey had dragged out from the Friday morning until the Tuesday morning had set in. It follows, therefore, that the party started from Philippi on a Friday.

The only question that remains is whether the company started on the first morning after the Days of Unleavened Bread. Considering that the plan was to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost, and that time was therefore precious, we need not hesitate as to this point. On the first morning after the Days of Unleavened Bread, Paul³ and Luke started from Philippi to go down to Neapolis and take ship there.

The conclusion, then, is unavoidable: the slaying of the Passover in that year fell on the afternoon of a Thursday, and the Seven Days of Unleavened Bread continued till the following Thursday. That was the case in A.D. 57, but not in any of the years immediately around it. For example, in A.D. 58, when the great majority of modern scholars date the journey, the Passover was slain on a Monday, and the last Day of Unleavened Bread was the

¹ ἤλθομεν ἄχρι ἡμερῶν πέντε, xx. 6.

² ἤλθομεν πεμπταίοι.

³ I cannot agree with the inference drawn by some (including Blass) from xx. 4, that Paul was in Asia, and that Luke the Greek attached such importance to the Jewish festival as to wait in Philippi over it; nor does it seem in keeping with Luke's conception of the relative importance of events that he should chronicle so minutely the movements of the party, if Paul was not in it.

Monday following. In that case the journey from Philippi would have begun on Tuesday morning; Troas would have been reached on Saturday; and the stay in Troas must have lasted until the second Monday thereafter, continuing through eight complete days and parts of two other days. Lewin, in his *Fasti Sacri* (one of the most useful books¹ on this whole subject that have ever been written), states this clearly; and he proceeds to reconcile it with the words of *Acts* by a method which seems to me no reconciliation, but a mere statement of discrepancy.

To this date, which is assumed in my *St. Paul the Traveller* as a fixed point from which to reckon the whole chronology of the period before and after, the following objections are likely to be made, and may therefore be briefly considered.

(1) Our dating implies that Felix vacated office, and Festus entered upon office as procurator of Judæa in the summer of A.D. 59. It is held by many that Festus came to Palestine either in 60 or 61 (the date 60 being regarded by them as much more probable than 61); but, as Schürer (who leans to the date 60) concedes, in the end of his careful and judicious note, the facts recorded about Felix and Festus are not inconsistent with any date from 58 to 61.² The most important argument for the view that Felix continued to hold office later than A.D. 59 lies in the statement made by Paul, *Acts* xxiv. 10, that Felix had acquired familiarity with the Jews during a government of many years; but, as Tacitus says that in A.D. 52 Felix had been already for a long time governor over Judæa,³ those who agree with

¹ I mean *useful* in practice, though there is hardly a single point of chronology, where doubt could exist, in which I agree with him. He has strained all to suit a very artificial theory.

² Lightfoot and others have said that the events mentioned by Josephus after the accession of Nero under Felix's administration would require longer time than from 54 to 59: this argument does not convince Schürer, and I see no strength in it.

³ Jampridem Judææ impositus, *Annals*, xii. 54: one of those interesting

Mommsen in preferring the authority of Tacitus to that of Josephus on this point will find the words of Paul entirely justified.¹

There is therefore no reason possessing even the smallest cogency to force us to date the end of Felix's government later than 59; and some excellent authorities have even placed it earlier. The argument from *Acts* xx. 5 ff., which leads us to date it exactly in that year, may therefore have full weight.

(2) Reckoning backward from 57 as the date of Paul's fifth journey to Jerusalem, we are obliged to date the proconsulship of Gallio in Achaia as beginning in the summer of 52. If the statement made by Lightfoot² that Gallio must have been consul before he became proconsul of Achaia were correct, it would be conclusive against our date; for it is practically impossible to date Gallio's consulship early enough to admit of his governing Achaia in 52. But the statement is not correct, and is doubtless a mere slip of the pen or of the memory on the part of Lightfoot, who is remarkably accurate on all matters of Roman antiquities. Achaia was a province of the inferior senatorial class, governed by ex-prætors with the title of proconsul. The rule acted upon by Augustus, and observed by all later emperors (with the rarest exceptions), was that not less than five years must elapse between the holding of the magistracy in Rome and the proconsulship of a province.³

pieces of evidence from Tacitus, which justify the theory of early history for which I contend.

¹ Even if Josephus were right in making Felix's government of Judæa begin in 52, the remark has been often made that in comparison with the rapid change of procurators since A.D. 36, the years of Felix's rule might in 57 be fairly called "many."

² Smith's *Dict. of the Bible*, ed. II., vol. i., p. 35, col. 2, art. "Acts of the Apostles."

³ Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, ii. p. 248 f. Lewin, *Fasti Sacri*, p. 300, is wrong on this point, and his whole reasoning about the date of Gallio's proconsulship is vitiated thereby. It in some cases happened that the ex-prætor became consul before his turn came for a proconsulship. Lightfoot identifies Gallio's voyage

Gallio's prætorship, therefore, must have been earlier than A.D. 47. His brother Seneca was prætor in A.D. 50; but Gallio seems to have been older than Seneca, who speaks of him as *dominus meus Gallio*, in the respectful language of a younger brother about the older;¹ and it is therefore quite natural that Gallio should have held the prætorship before his younger brother. If we may assume that Gallio shared in the disgrace of his more famous brother Seneca from 41 to 49, the prætorship of Gallio would have to be dated at latest in 41.² At any rate there seems no more difficulty in dating his proconsulship in 52 than in 53 (the date preferred by Lightfoot, Renan, and others); for even the later date demands that Gallio was prætor before 48.

This date, and the date of the famine which began in the second half of A.D. 45, give us, according to my view, two points in the life of Paul.³ Now Luke, while loose in his expression as to lapse of time, shows great accuracy and art in regard to the chronological sequence of events; and my contention is that he has put in our hands the means of fixing with great precision the entire chronology of the early Christian history. This is, of course, true only on the "South-Galatian theory": the chronology remains uncertain on the "North-Galatian theory," but that is, in our view, the unavoidable consequence of a wrong theory. There seems to be no ground for doubt except on one point. It might plausibly be argued that the party sailed from

from Achaia in search of health (see *Ep.*, 104) with his voyage to Alexandria after his consulship (Pliny, *N.H.*, xxxi. 33); but the latter was apparently undertaken from Italy (see my *St. Paul*, p. 261).

¹ *Ep.*, 104, 1: As a title of courtesy, *dominus* was very freely used, cp. Sueton., *Claud.*, 21 (where, however, it had an obvious purpose); but it would probably not ordinarily be used by an elder brother about a younger. That Gallio was the elder brother is certain on other grounds.

² It may be inferred probably from *Consol. ad Helviam*, 18, 2, that Gallio had attained the prætorship before Seneca's exile.

³ The date of his visit to Jerusalem varies within certain limits (*St. Paul*, p. 51); I would now fix it to near November, 45; but no confidence can be felt, as yet, on that point.

Troas so early in the morning that Luke does not reckon the Monday as part of the stay in Troas, but makes the Sunday the last of the seven days; in that case the slaying of the Passover would have taken place in that year on a Wednesday afternoon. But I cannot accept that view, both because it violates the general principle which Luke observes in making such reckonings of time, and because it happens that in the years 56-59 (which are the only ones that need be taken into account) the Passover was never slain on a Wednesday: the days were in 56 Friday,¹ in 57 Thursday, in 58 Tuesday, and in 59 Sunday.

It is assumed in this paper that Luke reckoned the twenty-four hours Civil Day² from midnight to midnight, according to the common practice of Roman imperial time, and did not follow the Jewish and the religious custom of counting from sunset to sunset; but our reasoning would not be affected (in reality it would be strengthened against the doubt stated in the preceding paragraph), if we suppose him to have reckoned from sunset to sunset.

The question as to Paul's and Luke's reckoning of years may be touched on here, as connected with our present subject. I think that both Luke and Paul, at least when writing to Gentile congregations like those of Galatia or Achaia, reckoned the years according to the Asian, Macedonian, and Seleucid fashion as beginning from the autumn equinox, not from the spring equinox, according to the fashion of Damascus³ and of the Jews, nor from 1st January, according to Roman custom. Hence the fourteenth year before 56 might possibly be 44;⁴ for the year 1 would end

¹ According to Lewin, Friday, 19th March, but according to Wieseler, *Chronol.*, p. 115, Sunday, 18th April, was the 14th Nisan in A.D. 56.

² See EXPOSITOR, vol. vii., 1893, p. 219 f., a paper "About the Sixth Hour."

³ See Clermont Ganneau, *Revue Archéolog.*, 1884, ii. p. 268, and *Statement Palest. Expl. Fund*, 1896, January.

⁴ The statement to that effect in *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 60, has roused some suspicion that I had made a wrong reckoning.

Sept. 22, A.D. 44, and the year 14 would begin Sept. 23, A.D. 56. Similarly the fourteenth year after an event which occurred about August, A.D. 33, would begin on Sept. 23, A.D. 45. Probably Barnabas and Saul went up to Jerusalem in the late autumn or winter of 45, after the failure of harvest in Palestine and the southern parts of Syria in the summer of 45 was being felt in growing famine. The journey to Damascus and the appearance of Jesus to Paul might have occurred in the year ending 22 Sept., 33 A.D.

But is it not possible to find some external evidence by which to test our theoretical results about the chronology and history of the period? That further knowledge will be discovered soon, when investigators cease to confine themselves to theorizing on the old evidence and turn their attention to the discovery of new evidence, is in the highest degree probable. In the meantime it deserves notice that the views which are here set forth place in a new light the statements of some early and good authorities. In the *EXPOSITOR*, May, 1895, p. 391, I quoted the evidence, precise and explicit, given by Asterius, bishop of Amaseia, about 400 A.D., in favour of the South-Galatian theory. It would not be easy to find a better authority, for the geography of central Asia Minor must have been in a general way familiar to him; and when he interprets "the Galatic Territory" in *Acts* xviii. 23 as Lycaonia, it is difficult to see any other explanation except that he repeats unbroken tradition, according to which Derbe and Lystra were two of the Pauline "Churches of Galatia."

I would now refer to another piece of evidence, which appears also to possess good claim to trustworthiness. In an oration on Peter and Paul ascribed to Chrysostom,¹ it is stated in an incidental way that Paul suffered martyrdom in the sixty-eighth year of his age and the thirty-fifth

¹ It is ranked among the spurious orations by Montfaucon, vol. viii. p. 621,

of his Christian career. The writer says nothing about the age of Peter, and we may therefore conclude that he believed himself to have authority for stating the age of the one Apostle and not of the other: in other words, he had access to a tradition (which he accepted as trustworthy) about the age of Paul, while he knew no good tradition about the age of Peter. The question then remains, What was the value of the tradition about Paul's age? We might answer the question by putting some other questions—(1) Is it probable that such a tradition would be a pure invention? To me it seems very improbable. A Pauline legend undoubtedly grew in the centuries that followed the Apostle's death; but facts of that kind are not the stuff of which such legends were usually made. The most natural and easy explanation of its origin is that it was a tradition dating back to the memory of Paul's own circle. (2) Does the statement disagree with any of the known facts of Paul's life? On the contrary, it agrees excellently with the dates which we have deduced from an examination of the evidence given by Paul himself and by Luke. We may safely say that (to those who accept the argument that Paul was acquitted on his first trial) there can hardly be any doubt that his martyrdom took place about 67 A.D. It is improbable that the many events and journeys implied in the Pastoral Epistles could have occurred in so short a time as to permit us to place his execution so early as 66. Our dates then place his death in the thirty-fifth year of his Christian career.

Further, it seems clear that the public career of Paul began after the Crucifixion, *i.e.*, not earlier than the summer of A.D. 30. He was still a young man at the time of Stephen's death (*Acts* vii. 58); but yet he was then old enough to be taking a prominent part in public business

second edition, Paris, 1836; it probably belongs to the period following Chrysostom, and to the circle of the Asia Minor Church.

(xxvi. 10 f., ix. 1 f.).¹ It is a fair and probable view that he would begin public life shortly after entering on his thirtieth year, according to the regular Jewish custom. If, then, he were born in A.D. 1, he would complete his twenty-ninth year in A.D. 30, not long after that he would enter public life, and by A.D. 33 he would naturally be in a position to play a prominent part. The year beginning 23 Sept. 67, might be called his sixty-eighth year. Thus we have good reason to accept as in itself probable the statement of this ancient authority. But it is certainly an advantage in the theory which we have set forth, that it takes up these ancient witnesses, and justifies them, while at the same time its own strength is thereby increased. These various independent witnesses mutually support and corroborate each other.

In conclusion, I may be permitted a word of explanation as to my attitude in this question towards the late Bishop Lightfoot. If, in the opinion of dispassionate scholars, after the present storms of controversy have died away, I should be judged to have shown some small degree of the same spirit in seeking after truth as that great scholar, I should be well content. For his genius, for his scholarship, I have entertained the highest admiration since my undergraduate days; ² for his personal kindness to me as a beginner I feel gratitude that grows stronger and warmer as the years pass by. But his immense and well-earned influence is now supporting an error that could only have arisen about an unknown land. Our position in regard to the *Acts* may be illustrated from another subject. Lightfoot rightly caught the ring of genuineness in the traditional epitaph of Avircius Marcellus, amid all the corruptions that defaced it. Rightly

¹ In A.D. 61 he calls himself an old man, according to the generally accepted reading of Philem. 9. The Greeks had a broad distinction between "young men" and "old men."

² See *Church in the Roman Empire*, pp. 6, 8, etc.

maintaining its authenticity, he attempted to disprove the arguments which seemed to older scholars, like Tillemont and Garrucci, to be conclusive proof of its spuriousness; but his discussion of the evidence was wrong throughout.¹ Fortunately he lived to recognise the complete change which better knowledge of the country necessitated; and in the latest edition he cut out the whole of his erroneous discussion, and substituted a brief reference to the real facts. Had he died a few years earlier, I should still have been struggling against the almost universal belief in England that his discussion of the subject must be correct. On the other hand, had his life been prolonged a few years more, he would have been the first to see (long before I saw) the bearing of the new information about Phrygia, Lycaonia, and Galatia, on the foundation of the early Church in Asia Minor; he would have himself corrected the errors about the history and geography of these countries that were inevitable, when his earlier works were written; I should never have been compelled to assume the position of criticising him, but have been free to be in external appearance, as I always have been in reality, his humble admirer; and, finally, I should have been spared the pain of seeing that my friend Dr. Sanday says that I have "held up to ignominy" as either "intellectually or morally discreditable" the mistakes which Lightfoot's untimely death has left for me to point out. I have pointed out the plain and simple facts: evidence will accumulate, and new discoveries will be made, and the truth will become apparent to all in time.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ See his edition of *Colossians*, pp. 54 ff.

*A MEANS TOWARDS ARRIVING AT A MORE
CORRECT HEBREW TEXT OF THE OLD
TESTAMENT.*

THE encouraging and stimulating article on the Septuagint in the last number of the *EXPOSITOR* leads me to hope that the time has now come for proposing seriously the following undertaking with reference to the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. I feel that I may venture to press my suggestion after the experience of sixteen years of constant work—on an average, I suppose, for four hours a day all the year round—on the text of the Septuagint and a comparison of it with the Hebrew. The great object in view has been to indicate the correspondence between the Greek and the Hebrew, and to show the Hebrew word corresponding to the Greek word wherever possible in the Oxford Concordance to the Septuagint. This laborious work has made me, as time has gone on, more and more anxious to see an unpointed edition of the Hebrew text printed, with notes showing the variations of the Massoretic text from that indicated by the versions where the reading or pointing of the two would be different. The work aimed at may be treated more fully under the following heads:—

(a) The unpointed Hebrew should naturally follow the best editions of the Hebrew Bible as now printed, such for instance as that of Baer. The Keri and C'thikh should also be given. Where it is quoted the Massoretic text should be that of Baer as a rule.

(b) Whenever there is any approach to certainty, the Hebrew, as read by the version, should be given. It might also be possible to indicate by a difference of type cases in which it was clear that the reading of the version was the better one. Wherever the version has additional matter no attempt should be made to represent this in Hebrew, but

the additions or omissions could be set forth in the margin. When a double or even a triple rendering occurs of the same passages, it might be well sometimes to notice these. The versions to be included should be any up to and including that of Jerome; and any further light which can be thrown on the text by quotations occurring in authors of an earlier date than Jerome should also be made use of. In cases where it is impossible to guess at the reading of the version the words of the version might be quoted. At the present moment there are scattered about in various commentaries and other works many indications of the readings which the versions had, but I do not know of any way in which it is possible without great labour to lay one's hand upon any suggestions that have been made as to what was the Hebrew text read by the version in any particular case when it differs from the present Hebrew text.¹ Wherever the version is paraphrastic of the present Hebrew text it should be passed by in silence.

It is not always easy to convince others of the impressions one has formed oneself and to persuade them of the truth of them. But these sixteen years of constant study of the Hebrew text have made me form an estimate of the Massoretic text, in particular as to its pointing, which is not a very high one. It seems to me sometimes to be inconsistent with itself, sometimes to make laboured differences between one passage and another which probably had no existence originally, and sometimes to create difficulties which need not exist without it. It might be difficult at the moment to give exactly chapter and verse for each of these conclusions, but they have gradually become settled opinions with me.

With such an Old Testament before us the ground would be cleared for a careful consideration of the relative value

¹ Schleusner's Lexicon helps us to a certain point in this respect; but many of his suggestions are very uncritical.

throughout of the variations from the present text and of the value which should in each case be attached to one reading or the other. To my mind this is of much more permanent and pressing interest than the question, how many redactions or how many hands we are to find in any particular book. There is the book, as we have it ; let us be sure that we have the best reading of it.

In saying all this I am not at all asserting the inerrancy of the versions any more than I should be disposed to assert that of the Massoretic text. There are no doubt many places where, for instance, the LXX. is hopelessly astray ; but I think that Professor Kirkpatrick has been unduly severe upon that version in giving as a specimen of it the passage from Isaiah (ix. 1-7). If we were to take account of the whole translation, I suppose there is no part which we should rank lower than that of most of Isaiah.

Should any such edition of the Old Testament become possible, it might well be that its publication should be undertaken by one of the learned Universities. I am quite aware that editions of the unpointed text of the Hebrew Bible are held to be a drug in the market, but the collection of such a body of information as might be incorporated with it would be of great value to the student of Old Testament literature.

HENRY A. REDPATH.

L I K E - M I N D E D .

(1 PETER III. 8-12.)

PETER now passes from the special precepts addressed to subjects, to servants, to wives, to husbands, and addresses men generally. The absence of self-assertion, the recognition of the authority and claims of others upon which he has insisted in certain specific relations, are now declared to be the characteristics of all Christian morality. We are to be "*like-minded*,"—to endeavour to be of the same mind with other people; are to try to look at things as they look at them; are to find no pleasure in asserting a difference of judgment; are to regard it as a calamity when we are obliged to differ from them. We are to be "*compassionate*,"—that is, sympathetic; rejoicing in their joy, and sorrowing in their sorrow; regarding their successes and triumphs, not with envy, but with delight, and their disappointments and humiliations with regret. We are to be "*loving as brethren*"—brotherly in all our temper; "*tender-hearted*,"—easily touched by other men's troubles, not hard, cynical, cold. We are to be "*humble-minded*,"—are not to claim distinction and consideration,—are not to think that we could claim them. "*Not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling; but contrariwise blessing.*" In return for evil, and in return for reviling, we are to try to do men good.

It is a lovely picture, it wins the heart; if we only approached its transcendent beauty, heaven would descend to earth.

But is it possible to practise precepts which require so wonderful a perfection? Can any man in the presence of provocation exercise such incessant self-restraint as these precepts demand? I suppose that the real answer to these questions is to be given by an appeal to the great precept of Christ: "If any man would come after Me, let him deny

himself, and take up his cross and follow Me." And our Lord's words carry this with them,—that we must deny Him, or deny ourselves; must reject His absolute claims to the control and direction of our personal life, or reject our own absolute claims to the control and direction of our personal life. It is of the essence of the unchristian life to reject Christ's claim. It is of the essence of the Christian life to reject our own claims; and when our own claims are once rejected—really rejected—everything else becomes easy.

But Peter invokes a special reason and motive for the duty of "not rendering evil for evil, or reviling for reviling, but contrariwise blessing"; "*for*," he says, "*hereunto were ye called, that ye should inherit a blessing.*"

He has not forgotten the great things that he said earlier in the epistle about the "inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away," and "the salvation ready to be revealed in the last time." The great hopes of the Christian life are necessary to the perfection of its power and its righteousness. It is possible for men to dream of the splendours of the eternal future, of its shining palaces, of its crowns and harps, and of the white robes of the saints and the river of joy that flows from beneath the throne of God, and to find in them no strength for present duty, or at best only a temporary alleviation of present sorrow. But to Peter, the great inheritance lies close to the plainest and most difficult Christian virtues. For him it is not mere idle dreaming to dwell on our infinite hopes. We are to render blessing to those who injure us, to those who revile us, because we were called "*to inherit a blessing.*"

He means, I suppose, that the infinite generosity of God to ourselves imposes upon us the obligation to be generous to others. Forgiven, we must forgive. We are destined to inherit blessings infinitely beyond our deserts; and we

must bless other men, not according to the measure of their deserts, but according to the measure of God's goodness to ourselves.

That seems reasonable. There is force in the appeal. But if we are to feel the force of it, and if God's goodness to ourselves in the eternal future is to make us good to other men during our earthly life, we must think of the greatness of the blessing which we are to inherit in Christ. And the inheritance does not merely create an obligation to render kindness for injury and for reviling; it confers strength to fulfil the obligation, and that in more ways than one.

The extreme readiness of men to take offence arises partly from the exaggerated importance which they attach to the careless, reckless, or malignant conduct of others; and it is a matter of common observation that people whose interests are very limited, whose range of thought and life is very narrow, are, as a rule, much more sensitive both to the smaller offences and to the graver injuries which they may receive from those about them than are people whose life is large and more animated. It is said, for example, that in the society of small country towns people are often estranged for years by the most trivial and accidental things. In a larger, freer society men never notice offences which in the narrower society would be unpardonable. And even real and grave wrongs are forgotten when we have more important matters to occupy us.

And so a man who sees before him the great blessing which he is destined to inherit, becomes very indifferent to a thousand petty causes of vexation which would tease and torment him if he had not the vision of that eternal future. What does it matter that this person treats him with discourtesy, or speaks roughly to him, or tries to deprive him of the credit of some kindly and generous act, or

slanders him? What does it matter that another person crosses his plans, gives him unnecessary trouble, occasions losses to him, injures him seriously? What does it matter? It may be necessary to take some notice of the wrong-doer, sometimes to punish him. But there is no reason to get excited, to suffer the blow to be perceived, to writhe in pain and passion. There is a certain largeness of mind created by the habit of looking beyond our mortal years to the ages of the eternal future; and we learn to regard the transient injuries which we receive from people about us as of very small importance, and as not grave enough to justify us in regarding them with any deep and enduring hostility. It then becomes easy to forgive those who have wronged us, and easy to do them good.

But, further, the joy which the hope of the future inspires inclines us to generosity and kindness. Happy people are usually good-tempered people. They do not take offence easily; when offence is given and felt, they soon forget it. Their buoyancy and brightness make them unwilling to retain the memory of injury. For to remember the wrongs which have been done us is to embitter our present delights. It is the people whose spirits are low, who have no genius for joy, that find offence where no offence was meant, that brood over every imaginary indication of neglect on the part of their friends, and that preserve through year after year—as if it was their most precious possession—the memory of real injuries. Make them happy, and they will find it easy to forgive. And the blessing which we are called to inherit, if we thought of it more, would make it easy for us all to return good for evil.

First, then, Peter appeals to the great inheritance which is the object of Christian hope, to give force to the precepts in which he inculcates generosity and kindness, and the repression of self-assertion. This inheritance, as I have tried to show, creates an obligation to practise these

virtues, and the hope and anticipation of it encourage a disposition which will make it easy to practise them.

But now he takes another line. He quotes an ancient psalm (Psalm xxxiv. 12-15) to show that even in this life these virtues receive a reward from heaven: "For he that would love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile: and let him turn away from evil, and do good; let him seek peace and pursue it. For the eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and His ears unto their supplication: but the face of the Lord is upon them that do evil." Long life and happiness in this world come, as a rule, to the men that keep these precepts. The laws of the moral order of the world are on their side. This is confirmed by universal experience.

If a man "*would see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil.*"

Is not that true? Have not very bad days come to many men, and come to some of us, because we have not exercised self-restraint? Sharp, keen, bitter words came to our lips, and we let them go; words which wounded, stung, and tormented people who, as we thought, had wronged us. We saw them writhe, and we enjoyed it. We triumphed in our power to anger and to distress them. But the enjoyment and the triumph were soon over and forgotten. The words were not forgotten by the people that suffered from them. We made enemies who for months and years were able to annoy us. Other people fell away from us: they regarded us with distrust. At a moment when it was necessary for us to have the confidence of men in our temper and courtesy, we found that the confidence had gone.

It is necessary now and then to speak strongly, but we should always ask ourselves whether it *is* necessary. We should ask not whether we should be justified in speaking,

but whether we should be justified in not speaking; not have I a right to say these hard things? but, am I bound to say them?

Some men would say that when they are greatly provoked and feel strongly they must speak. Well, there is no harm in speaking. But, go a couple of miles into the country, and speak there, if you want relief; or go into a room by yourself, and have it out there. Or, if you can do it better by writing, write by all means; but keep the letter in your desk for a week, and then burn it.

But this is not all. "Let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his *lips that they speak no guile*." It is not merely from angry and malignant words that we have to refrain, but from guile, if we are to live in peace.

And is not that also true? Have not the lies men have told brought them more trouble than the faults they were intended to hide?

And even when men get into the habit, not of telling what they themselves would call lies, but of "speaking guile"—putting a colour upon things, telling half the truth when the whole truth is expected—does not experience show that they are certain to have trouble from it? I am not sure whether the plausible people who mislead you by telling the truth are not more pernicious and more intolerable than the people who mislead you by telling positive falsehoods. I feel a greater scorn for them; I trust them less. The man who tells a lie—what he sees to be a lie when he tells it—knows that he is not telling the truth. His conscience is not blinded. There is something in him to reckon with. But the slippery man, whose words, when you come to test them, are true as far as they go, but are intended to have all the effect of falsehood,—he thinks that he is telling the truth while he is practically telling a lie: his conscience is at fault. I never know when I can trust him. And when trouble comes to him, as trouble is sure to come, he

will assume the airs of an injured saint, and provoke worse trouble still.

But further, "*let him turn away from evil and do good.*" All evil-doing soon brings outward sorrow, or clouds inward joy, or does both. "*Let him do good*"; in righteousness is joy and strength.

And this is not all. "*Let him seek peace and pursue it.*" Ah! what "good days" we should have in families, churches, political parties, and all the world over, if men and nations set their hearts on peace—resolved to have it, pursued it, hunted it down as the sportsman hunts his game. But that is not a common pursuit. Some men seem never at peace—except when they are quarrelling. They insist on their utmost rights. They will concede nothing. They will not acknowledge any equals, much less any superiors. To differ from them in opinion is an offence; to cross them accidentally is a crime. They insist that all men should consent to be planets revolving in systems of which they are the central suns. Their own claims are enforced by the thunders of Sinai; to refuse to admit them is to be guilty of the worst villainy. Other men's claims cannot be listened to till theirs are completely discharged. They never think of peace except as the result of conquest.

There are such people, and they have neither good days themselves nor do they allow other men to have good days. And although we ourselves, let us hope, are free from the more flagrant forms of this horrible vice, let us not assume too easily that we are altogether free from it.

I have said that in these words Peter is quoting a Psalm, but he quotes it with a very remarkable and suggestive modification of its terms.

The Psalm (xxxiv. 12) reads: "*What man is he that desireth life, and loveth many days, that he may see good?*" Peter gives it: "*He that would love life and see good days.*"

That is a suggestive change. Life will be a trouble if we do not refrain our tongue from evil and our lips from guile ; if we do evil instead of good. If we do not seek peace, then we shall not love life ; we shall find no joy in it ; we shall ask the question that was discussed a few years ago, "Is life worth living?"

If we would *love* life and see good days, we must be truthful, kindly, peaceful. What sanity there is in New Testament ethics ! Think of an apostle pointing out the way in which we are to come to *love* this present life ! The common impression is that the Christian faith necessarily creates an impatience to have life over. And Peter has been speaking of the infinitely glorious future, the supreme hope of the Church ; this is the principal topic of his epistle. And yet he tells us what we are to do if we are to love life.

It is not most commonly the energy of faith that makes a man weary of this life, but its weakness ; not sanctity, but sin. Sometimes, under the strain of protracted sickness, pain, disappointment, trouble, a Christian man may long to depart and be with Christ ; but the discontent, the enduring gloom, the desolation, which make it impossible to *love* life, usually come from other causes.

The tongue has not been refrained from evil, and friends have been lost who would have given brightness to the darkest days ; it has not been refrained from guile, and the confidence of friends who remain has ceased to be cordial ; or there has been perpetual war, with frequent defeats, because the heart has not sought and pursued peace. And so at last a man has made everybody about him his enemy ; or there has been still more flagrant ill-doing, and the ill-doing has brought disaster.

The morality of the New Testament, I say, is sane. Well-doing brings peace and joy in this world, and it is no element of Christian perfection to regard this life with

dissatisfaction and to wish it over. We are here by God's appointment; we already possess God's love. The song of rejoicing should be in the tabernacle of the righteous, and the great hope of immortality, while it lightens the weight of earthly troubles, should do nothing to lessen our delight in earthly happiness.

R. W. DALE.

THE IDEAL PREACHER.

THE embassy of the Baptist to Christ¹ is an incident in the life of the Forerunner which has always enlisted the attention of students of the Gospel narrative. "Art Thou the coming One, or are we to expect another?" Does the challenge represent an eclipse of faith, or does it not? and for whose sake was the question addressed by John to the Lord? It seems as if the data were insufficient to make a reply which should be final. It is difficult enough to calculate upon our own conduct under unexpected conditions, and how is it possible to forecast the issues in the case of others? Every crisis in each several human life marks also a new departure in morals, and before there can be any certain anticipation of its direction, one must be in full possession both of the nature and stability of the moral principle of the individual. But here adequate knowledge is denied to men; they can only guess, surmise, or infer, and always from imperfect premises. Yet they often make conclusions as if there was a complete science of human character, and as if there was a uniform line of conduct for all under like conditions. For such speculations this narrative has presented a field of special interest, partly from the greatness of the two figures which occupy it, partly because of the touch of nature in it, which so

¹ St. Matt. xi, 2-15, and St. Luke vii. 18-30.

far has made all enquirers "kin." To be transparently loyal to a lofty ideal and yet to find the ideal itself obscured by some depressing cloud of circumstance, what Christian, since the Baptist's time, is not humbly conscious that he is the one, and has at times painfully made the other experience? The narrative is clear enough upon the point that the Baptist felt depressed. That this depression of spirits was not natural to him is plain from the character and success of his mission; ¹ it was the outcome of his circumstances.² Place any man of high aims, and with splendid performances in the past, in a Machærus which renders further enterprise impossible, and he will be greater than the Baptist if he does not feel and express it. Indeed the special greatness of the Baptist appears to lie in the fact that the expression was unselfish. If he felt the issue deeply for himself, he felt it still more for that faithful band of followers who clung no less loyally to their Master in the fortress than when they streamed forth to Him in the free spaces of the desert. If any needed cheering, surely these disciples did, nor could any one speak the word of comfort save Christ, to whom they were despatched.

It appears that the Baptist selected two³ messengers for the honourable and anxious task of seeking an interview with Jesus. One can imagine them filled with the same kind of forebodings as pursued Clopas and his unnamed companion on the journey to Emmaus, for the conditions have singular analogies in occasion and circumstance: a master, it would seem, fallen, high hopes dashed, the enemies of truth and goodness and purity triumphant. It seems not unnatural to suppose that the precise form which their enquiry took was due to the anxiety which they were experiencing. It may be that the Baptist

¹ St. Matt. iii. 5.

² St. Matt. xi. 2, ἐν τῷ δεσμῷ ἡλῶ.

³ δύο τινὰς, St. Luke vii. 18. Cf. St. Matt. xi. 2, v.l.

simply charged them with the question, "Art Thou the coming One?" and that his messengers added the alternative challenge, "or are we to expect another?" It was a question of timorous hearts, yet it needed some boldness in the putting. How would the enthusiastic witnesses of Christ's wonder-working power receive such an embassy? how would the Lord Himself entertain it? Must they return with their mission discredited, with some short, sharp rebuke for themselves and their master ringing in their ears, or would their faith and his receive a fresh and gracious confirmation from His sacred lips? The narrative of Emmaus has again its suggestions. There the slow intelligence of the two companions upon the way was quickened by reminding them of the testimony of the Scriptures,¹ here a pause intervenes before the rebuke falls. Once more in the presence of the ambassadors Christ addresses Himself to His wonted tasks of love and pity. Their case needed strong demonstrations of His character, His office, and His power; when He had given these, and not before, comes the chiding, which is itself a new beatitude, "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in Me." It is impossible not to discern a rebuke in such language. The Baptist had not yet reached that height of bliss, though he was still to reach it, when no stumbling-block hindered the free avenue of his approach to the idea of Jesus the Son of God.

The messengers had either left or were on the point of departure,² and were taking back to the Baptist not only Christ's words but the witness of their eyesight, for this was an integral part of the Lord's reply. But how about the reputation of the Baptist? Was this to remain for ever with a slight put upon it, tarnished and damaged, and this in the presence, doubtless, of many of his followers? To

¹ St. Luke xxiv. 25.

² St. Matt. xi. 7. Cf. St. Luke vii. 24.

suppose this possible would be to imagine the Lord as destitute of that tender consideration for the feelings of others which marks His character through and through. Hence the word of rebuke has hardly passed His lips before He hastens to repair and make good such a loss. He therefore delivers an encomium upon the Baptist's career. He recalls to the multitudes the scene and circumstance of the Baptist's ministry. He presents them with an ideal portrait of any one who down the ages should announce Him, through good and evil report, as the Messiah and the Saviour. He takes occasion from the circumstance to declare His view, a divine view, as to the source as well as to the power of all influence that is true, and great, and lasting. He presents the Church with a just conception of all that is best in the life and character of a Preacher of the Gospel. It is needless to say that His method of statement fit place and time and hearers. No ethical treatise follows, His audience were not philosophers, there is no subtle analysis of motives, no attempt at making the picture harmonious by sacrificing fidelity to life ; but in a way which would triumphantly appeal to simple Orientals, He invites His hearers while the memories of the great desert missionary were still strong upon them to ask themselves the secret of such influence which was supremely his. The method adopted was in the form of a threefold challenge to that intelligent and enthusiastic devotion which they still were right in paying to the Baptist. Why was it paid to him? why were they spellbound under his power? what was the great secret of his influence? Why did he compel a more than respectful attention from Pharisees and publicans, from peasants and soldiers on the march, from kings and courtiers? ¹

The threefold challenge is severally followed by suggested replies, and each of these in turn is rejected not as wholly

¹ Cf. St. Luke iii. 7-20.

false, but as entirely inadequate. The suggestions are conveyed in parabolic form, and as such deserve more consideration than may be given them within the limits of this paper; all that may now be observed is that the figures employed are of extreme simplicity and force, and that the appeal they make to mind and heart is direct and inevitable. To this may be added that the figures standing by themselves appear as ranged in the order of probability. The reed, the rich man, the prophet. It is within the bounds of possibility that a man might be drawn to study some of the natural and characteristic features of the desert, and among these would certainly be its hapless and pitiful vegetation. But there would be a wretched sameness in its forlorn appearance as the dry stalks and foliage waved wearily to and fro with the breeze. Nor, again, would the spectacle of a rich man in the desert, however familiar the phenomenon may be in this century, the startling contrast of his fine clothes and high living with the arid waste and miserable sustenance around, evoke anything but a passing protest and surprise at such an incongruity. Nor, once more, would a mere preacher or teacher detain attention longer. True, indeed, it might be that the trumpet-call of truth and duty had been heard, and might be heard again, in the wilderness. The message of civilization will best find a hearing in the streets, in the theatre, in the senate; philosophy calls for the quiet of the academic grove, the lecture-room, the study; the voice of science needs the medium of the museum and the laboratory; but the gospel challenges attention wherever its news is spread; indeed its success sometimes seems the greater when the surroundings are to all appearances uncongenial. Its forth-tellers need not despair if they find themselves in the wilderness, for, if ancient prophecy is to be trusted, it shall be glad for them, "it shall rejoice and blossom as the rose," The glories of Lebanon, of Carmel, and Sharon shall be

given unto it.”¹ But if so, the prophet must make his appeal to heart as well as to mind; he must not concern himself merely with the problems of existence, or of economics, or of nature, or of ethics; he must speak of sin, sorrow, and suffering, and of their eternal remedies, and his message must be one of hope for the life of men here and hereafter. Here, however, we are somewhat anticipating the order of the present enquiry.

It is almost impossible not to come to the conclusion, as one reads between the lines of our Lord’s panegyric upon the Baptist, that He is presenting to His hearers three several types of human influence, the first of temper, the second of position, the third of intellect, and is showing them, and through them us down the ages, that the secret of true influence does not lie in any of these sources. It will be observed that He does not wholly depreciate such powers in society, only that of themselves and by themselves they lack the strong compelling force which shall first draw and then hold mankind.

I. First, then, is that kind of influence which is the outcome of disposition and temperament. There is that gentle type which in its measure is distinctly of the Christian character, meek, easy to be entreated, amiable. “The reed skaken by the wind” does not seem to picture a mere “Pliable,” while it furnishes a portrait of a loving, yielding heart. But the Preachers of the Gospel must be of sterner stuff than this. The popular estimate of amiability is one which Christianity is bound to endorse according to the Master’s suggestion. They must prove themselves lion-like as well as lamb-like, for the kingdom of heaven has to be won by violence, and Christian experience is not exhausted by self-depreciation. The charms of a sweet and tender temper go far, and often will find an introduction for the Gospel message, but the moment that weakness is discernible

¹ Isa. xxxv. 2.

in such a disposition then the influence is paralysed, if not lost. The influence of such is at most narrow, personal, domestic; men will not "go forth" at the bidding of the amiable. To have the courage of one's convictions is absolutely essential to the success of one's ministry; there must be no thought of compromise, no concessions made to a low standard of public opinion, no pursuit of popularity for its own sake. In a word, men will not go out to see "a reed shaken by the wind."

II. It will seem strange to latter-day enthusiasts that Christ did not only not depreciate but assigned a measure of regard to influence of the second order—the influence of rank and wealth, of birth and station. He made none of those wild socialistic pronouncements with which we have become in these times so familiar. He was not for setting the masses against the classes. He who was aware of the danger of riches knew also the value and influence of wealth. It was one thing to put trust in riches, it was another to put them in trust. And for His followers to ignore the power of rank, of property, of social standing, is to shut the eye to the experiences of life and of society. The rich and great thus have their sphere. The socialistic cry is, "Away with possessions and possessors!" Christ declares that they have a place, not, it may be, in the kingdom of heaven, save by some convulsive effort like the proverbial entrance of a camel into a needle's eye,¹ but in kings' palaces. There, as the history of the Christian Church declares, the just and mild rule of princes who are good as well as great may effect much for the kingdom of heaven upon earth. But history also demonstrates how powerless such an influence often is to bring about the good order which it desires. It is checked and hindered by courtiers, subordinates, and officers lacking the high ideals and noble enthusiasms of their chief. The royal summons

¹ St. Matt. xix. 24, and parallels.

to virtue and godliness of living is drowned in the din of political faction and party interest. The voice is not clear enough or loud enough to reach the multitude. All the multitude can do is to see the gay clothing, and hear of the sumptuous fare. Men do not go out for such a spectacle as this; it has no strong attractive power for the human heart.

III. But supposing any true and lasting influence must be denied alike to sweetness of temper and to wealth and station—what of the prophet? Readers of the EXPOSITOR do not need to be reminded that the title has a far wider significance attaching to it than belongs to modern usage. In this passage it is clear that the predictive element is not in question. The prophet is the conspicuous teacher and preacher of the day, the man of commanding intellect, and persuasive talent. So far as the mind is the measure of the man he is bound to be a leader of men, for his is a master mind. Give such a one his sphere, let him have the chance of addressing an audience, and he will exercise a sway, the strong sway that is the outcome of intellectual gifts. It seems as if the source of influence was almost reached here. The language of Christ not only admits such influence, but affirms it, yet not without a grave qualification. Who can deny the impress upon thought left by such master minds as Plato and Aristotle, but the humblest student of philosophy perceives the limit of their influence? In the splendid days of Greek thought the area of philosophic influence was intensely narrow. The little band of masters and scholars which paced the academic grove ignored the common people; the idea that the message of philosophy could be appropriately conveyed to the multitude would have been scouted as a simple absurdity by the intellectual aristocracy. The case of philosophy remains the same to-day. Devotion to a teacher may bring about some wonders, but no one can ever create a wide enthusiasm out of mere speculation. The mass of mankind will not listen long to preaching of

this type. Humanity is conscious of evil, of sorrow, suffering and death, it has some faint forward hopes which it believes to be not wholly delusive; it would hear of remedies for the former, and confirmations of the latter. Hence it is written of Christ, as it could never have been written of Plato, that "the common people heard Him gladly."

A sweet temper, a commanding position, intellectual force, all are factors of success in any great missionary enterprise, and the preacher may not disregard them in his unselfish pursuit of influence. It appears that the Baptist was possessed of such gifts and advantages. Yet severally and collectively are they pronounced, and pronounced by Christ, inadequate. The ideal preacher of righteousness must both have and be "something more," "something far greater."

Even devout students may have regarded our Lord's recorded language at this point as somewhat vague. Yet a little attention to the quotation He makes from the last of the prophets,¹ taken in connexion with His subsequent utterances on the occasion, will surely make His meaning luminous. The greatness of any teacher or preacher, and therefore the greatness of his success, Christ measured simply by his credentials and his message. The Baptist was an apostle all but in name, if prophecy spoke rightly of him,² and his message was divine. It follows by consequence that unselfishness was the conspicuous note of his ministry; the personality was as nothing; the man became a voice.³ The ideal preacher must be unselfish too. If he gathers a party, a clique, a congregation about him, caught by some charm of manner, or delighted by his intellectual distinction, his message will be as quickly forgotten as himself. Self-effacement is the law of spiritual success. Preachers cannot at once serve truly the ministry of the Lord and their

¹ Cf. Mal. iii. 1. ² ἀποστέλλω, St. Luke vii. 27. ³ St. John i. 23.

own reputation, and the former often suffers grievously from the advancement of the latter.¹ But this was not the Baptist's danger; he had known something of the sweets of wielding great influence, but the secret of it largely lay in the fact that he could put it aside and say without any passionate regret, "I must decrease."²

One last thought remains. The view that "the lesser one in the kingdom of heaven" is indeed Christ Himself is not one to be summarily rejected, yet even if another interpretation is more wisely preferred, no student of the passage can avoid the conclusion that Christ now pointed His hearers to Himself. For in Him was united in perfect harmony every grace of temper, the awful dignity of Divine Sonship, and a revelation of the Father beyond the highest flights of sage or seer. But He too was about to illustrate something "greater still," for He came to do not His own but the Father's will, and to show all men that in love and in suffering lies the highest influence, since in and by His Passion He should draw all men after Him.³

B. WHITEFOORD.

¹ Cf. Gal. i. 10.

St. John iii. 30, ἐλαττωῦσθαι.

³ St. John xi. 32.

DIVINE EVOLUTION.

A CHAIN consists of a number of links united together to serve a common purpose. Geographers speak of a chain of mountains, meaning a number of peaks rising from the same elevated tableland. Scientific men speak of the chain of life, in which all the different forms of life, from the humblest to the highest, from the moss to the oak, from the animalcule to the elephant, form separate links, joined together by close vital relations. Darwin has given a most striking example of this chain of living forms, showing how the one is dependent upon the other, and that if one be lost or broken the whole chain is made useless. He tells us how the white clover in the neighbourhood of a certain town disappeared from the fields; and the reason he gives is that there were no humble bees to carry, in their search for honey, the pollen or fertilizing powder from one flower to another. And there were no bees, because the field-mice destroyed their nests and ate their honey and young grubs. And the mice had increased, because the cats that would have kept them in check were themselves killed by the street-boys in the town. Thus the disappearance of the clover in the field outside the town was caused by the disappearance of the cats inside it. These two ends of a wonderful chain were united by intermediate links, which most people would never have thought of, and if the one link was broken, all the rest were made of no avail. This striking correlation of forms and forces, producing results altogether different from any that one would have anticipated, is expressed in a very quaint and homely way, in the well-known nursery rhyme of "the House that Jack Built." As Shelley, with the far-reaching instinct of the true poet, says,—

“Nothing in the world is single;
All things, by a law divine,
In one another’s being mingle.”

All God’s works are closely related; and the Apostle Paul expressed a great scientific truth, which men have only found out in its fullest significance in these last days, that all things work, not separately, but *together* for good.

The prophet Hosea gives a most remarkable example of one of these chains of connexion between the things of Nature. He says: “And it shall come to pass in that day, I will hear, saith the Lord, I will hear the heavens, and they shall hear the earth; and the earth shall hear the corn, and the wine and the oil; and they shall hear Jezreel.”¹ This language is highly poetical. Dead things are represented as living and having the power of speech and personal action. This is in accordance with the faith of childhood, which believes that nature is not dead but living, that it is ruled not by physical forces, but by spiritual powers; a faith which grown-up people lose, but to which we need to be brought back if we are to realize that the whole world of nature is full of the presence of God, and that He moves and acts in everything we see. A picture is presented to us in the text of the whole process by which our food is procured. It leads our thoughts all along the chain of cause and effect, from man through Nature up to God.

Let us begin, then, by examining this wonderful chain at the most important point. Let us take the highest link first, contained in the words, “I will hear, saith the Lord.” The earth is a gigantic phonograph, whose varied voices are communicated along the whole line of natural means to the ear of the Almighty. A great cry for help goes up continually from earth to heaven, from multitudes of creatures that have no language but a cry; and the Lord hears that

¹ Hosea ii. 21, 22.

cry, and His providence gives them their meat in due season. He opens His hand and satisfies the desire of every living thing. But in the text what the Lord is represented as hearing specially is the cry of the human beings whom He made in His own image, and endowed with dominion over the world. In the fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer we are taught to ask that God would give us our daily bread. Our bodily life is one of incessant change. Day by day our bodies wear down with the friction of life, and portions of our frame become effete and are eliminated from the system. Day by day fresh material is formed, exactly replacing the wear and tear of each day. And the means whereby this reparation is maintained is the assimilation of appropriate food, taken into the circulation in sufficient quantity and at duly regulated intervals. And for this continuous supply of food for our continuous necessities we pray day by day to God.

Now it seems strange that we should be obliged to have recourse to prayer for what appears entirely under our own control, and is the result of our own labour. The procuring of our own food seems more than anything else within our own reach. We do so much to produce and earn it, that we are apt to think of no other agency in connexion with it but our own. And yet, when we are taught to pray to God for it, we are taught the true source from which it comes, and our own helplessness and dependence.

We cry for food, and the Lord says, "I will hear." He knows that we have need of food, for He has so made us. He has created food convenient for us, and He has made provision in the arrangements of Nature and Providence for the supply of the food. He does not give it to us straight out of His own hands. He does not rain it down from heaven, as once He did the manna in the wilderness. He bestows it upon us by intermediate agencies. God is emphatically the God of law; He always works by means

and secondary causes. And He gives us our daily bread, when we cry to Him, not arbitrarily or capriciously, but by and through the wise and beneficent instrumentalities which He has appointed. The etiquette of the Spanish court is so elaborate, that in order to get the smallest service performed for her, the queen has to communicate through so many functionaries that sometimes the necessity for the service is over before it can be rendered. And in some of our own departments of state, a petition has often to go through so many officials, that it takes days and weeks before it reaches the proper quarter, or secures the desired answer. But the household of Nature is no such circumlocution office as that. Every instrumentality is carried on by God's direct working. He is the living personal source of every force and form, of every life and movement in the universe. He works not merely at the extremity of the chain, but, like the electric spark, His will traverses and pervades the whole range of cause and effect, and concentrates and glows at the point of action. Each link fulfils its own special and relative purpose by the power which He imparts to it. The corn and the wine and the oil hear the prayer of man ; and the earth hears the prayer of the corn and the wine and the oil ; and the heavens hear the prayer of the earth, and the Lord hears the prayer of the heavens.

He is the only Potentate, the great Executive by which the laws of Nature are carried out. There is no inherent, essential power in any object or force of Nature ; power belongeth only unto God. The snowflake leads us to the sun, and our harvests lead us to God. It is He who crowns the year with His goodness, who makes the seed germinate, and the earth nourish its growth, and the sun ripen its fruitfulness. Not by a winding-up clockwork process, the accumulated force of which renders unnecessary any direct control, does He perform the work,

but by constant interposition all along the chain of causation from the first to the last link. What is this but a great process of evolution—evolution opening up to us a very wonderful vision of the way of God in the creation and in the ruling of the world. Evolution has been regarded with suspicion and dislike by the Church, because it has been too much allied with scepticism. It has been too much regarded as a self-generating, self-controlling process, independent of Divine help. All Theistic ideas have been eliminated from it. But, rightly considered, so far from favouring unbelief, the doctrine of evolution is in reality a true exposition of the method of Divine providence, and gives us a more exalted conception of it. The words of the prophet show to us that the law of evolution, which is just God's method of working, plays a very distinguished part in the ordering of the varied processes of Nature ; and that all its details are simply the carrying out of the creative and providential word, " I will hear, saith the Lord."

Let us now proceed to go down this wonderful chain, and look at the second link—" I will hear the heavens." The heavens above us, which in themselves are mere empty space, cry to God, and He fills them with the vital atmosphere, so marvellously compounded as to be suitable to the wants of every living thing. He distributes through it the poisonous carbonic acid gas, which is the food of plants, in such a skilful way that it cannot prove harmful to animal life, the one exhaling and the other inhaling it, and thus balancing each other ; and by the currents of heat and cold produces the winds and the storms which circulate the air, and keep it ever fresh and pure, to minister to the necessities of His creatures. He fills the heavens too, in answer to their cry, from the same glorious luminary, with light and heat and chemical power, and diffuses them with exact adaptation to the requirements of the earth, giving more chemical power to the sun's rays in spring for the

germination of seeds, more light to them in summer for purposes of growth, and more heat in autumn when the fruits have to be matured. He produces the seasons with their periods of rest and activity, and the alternations of day and night with their beneficent ministries. In the occurrence of the harvest moon which rises sooner after sunset, and continues to do so for more nights in succession than any other full moon in the year, we have a remarkable example of how God hears the heavens, and makes what we are apt in our ignorance to regard as a disadvantage, in the shortening days of autumn, to work for our good. The old saying that "after Lammas corn ripens by day and night," is literally true. Every farmer must have observed how very rapidly the moonlight not merely whitens but actually matures and ripens his corn. Then again the heavens cry to the Lord, and He fills the thirsty air with latent vapour to satisfy its insatiable drought, and to prevent it from desiccating into mummies all vegetable and animal life. This vapour is always most abundant when it is most wanted by plants. It is condensed into clouds to shade the earth from the too ardent sunshine during the day, and to keep in its heat from being too rapidly radiated into space at night, and thus freezing to death every living thing. He balances these clouds most wonderfully in the blue sky, and sends them here and there on their missions of blessing. In all these wise and beneficent ways the Lord hears the heavens, and supplies them with what is essential to the life and welfare of all the creatures He has made.

Let us pass on to look at the next link in this remarkable chain. "The heavens shall hear the earth." The two elements of vegetable life are sunshine and rain; and the earth calls to the heavens day by day for the due regulation of these two potent factors in the production of the harvests of the earth. There is nothing more wonderful in the

scheme of Nature than the way in which the waters of the bitter ocean are employed to refresh and fertilize the parched earth. There they lie side by side, the sea and the land, and the waters cannot cross the fixed line that divides them till the sun lifts them up in a vaporous form into the sky, where they form clouds, and the currents of air convey them to the mountain-tops, and they discharge themselves as mists, rains and snows, which are the sources of the rivers, wells and streams that make the earth green and fertile. The prophet speaks of the rain coming down, and the snow from heaven, and returning not thither, but watering the earth, and making it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater. And by the slowest and most continuous of all modes of motion in the glacier on Alpine peaks above the snow-line, and by the gentle, gradual distillation from leaf to leaf among great masses of quaking moss on mountain-tops below the snow-line, the vapours of the sky in the loneliest solitudes return to fertilize the distant fields of man. In those dry and parched lands, where the heavens are as brass and the earth as iron, the soil, cracked and fissured with the baking heat, sends forth from each gaping crevice, as from a blistered lip, a cry to the heavens, and the heavens send down those timely rains without which everything must die. And on the other hand, the cold and spongy earth in northern latitudes, saturated with continuous rain, so that the grain will not ripen in the ear, and the sheaf will not winnow in the stook, and the crop is like to rot on the field, cries to the heavens for the warm sunshine to return, and the drying breezes to blow, so that her face may again smile with abundant fruitfulness. Thus God hears the earth when it cries to the heavens for sunshine or shower, to make its fields green and golden with the food of man and beast. Meteorologists have told us lately how the raindrops are

formed. The earth sends its dust up into the atmosphere, where it floats about at great heights. It there attracts and condenses the moisture hidden in the air, or stored up in the clouds. And just as a crystal is started in a solution by a nucleus of foreign matter, so each particle of dust in the atmosphere gathers the particles of vapour near it, and rounds them into a raindrop. Thus every raindrop requires a particle of dust to start it, and of course it takes the particle of dust down with it to the earth, and so purifies the air, and at the same time refreshes and fertilizes the earth. Is it not a wonderful thing that the earth should send up to the heavens its dust, and that the heavens should send it down again in the form of the blessed and cleansing rain! God in this wonderful way hears the prayer of the earth when it cries to the heavens, and makes its own dust, the very dust of its dry and parched thirst, to be the means of answering its prayer.

But let us look at the fourth link in the strange chain; "The earth shall hear the corn and the wine and the oil." How wonderful is the way in which the earth is prepared to grant the request of its own products! What vast machinery has been set in motion to form the fields in which our harvests can grow; the sea retiring and leaving dry land enriched with its fertilizing materials; rivers in their overflow depositing their sediment; volcanoes pouring down their lava streams, disintegrating, when cool, into the best of all soils; the glacier grinding down by its slow, heavy motion and pressure the strata of the earth into clay and mud; and the atmosphere weathering the granite rocks into sand, which, by the decay of countless successive generations of plants growing in it, has been converted into rich mould! How wisely have the materials of the soil been mixed so as to produce fruitful earth! Were the soil all of one kind, all limestone, or all clay, or all sand, nothing could grow in it. But sand is found in every field to allow

the fine roots of plants to penetrate into it, and to supply the flint which strengthens their stalks ; lime is also present to supply the elements of growth ; and clay to retain the moisture and give tenacity to the soil. And these ingredients are so happily blended in good soil that they do not retain too much moisture nor part with it too easily, and so regulate the degree of heat they acquire that the crop will not be too backward in spring nor too late in autumn. By the wise design of the Creator each corn-plant obtains its food from the soil by means of the tiny mouths at the end of each rootlet. And before the food can enter these little mouths it must be dissolved in water and then sucked in ; and the materials of the soil are so constituted that they can be readily dissolved and assimilated. God has also formed the stem and the leaves and the fruit of our food-plants in strict accordance with the weight they have to carry, that weight being regulated by the attraction of the earth ; and that attraction in its turn being in exact proportion to the size, density and distance of the sun and plants. It is a striking thought that the whole mass of the earth, from pole to pole and from centre to circumference, is nicely weighed and adjusted to keep our freckled corn in the position best suited for the growth and ripening of its own grain. Thus the earth hears the corn, the wine and the oil, and produces for them the conditions in which they can flourish. The seed is cast into the earth, and the earth helps it to expand and develop all its latent capabilities, and furnishes it with the materials of its growth, so that it brings forth fruit, in some thirty, in some sixty, and in some an hundredfold.

The last link in the chain is, that the corn, the wine and the oil shall hear Jezreel. Let us put aside the wine and the oil—for these do not form part of our food in this western and northern world—and confine ourselves to the consideration of the corn alone. There are very remarkable things connected with corn. It is a constant theme of wonder how

God has made the staple food of man to consist of the seed of an annual grass that grows and ripens and fades every year, and every season needs to be sown and reaped anew ; how in the various corn-plants man finds all the best constituents of nourishment and vigour ; how these corn-plants can be stored for a time of scarcity and transported without injury to the most distant places ; how some form or other of them can be cultivated in every part of the world ; and how, on the basis of security which they afford, a stable society can be built up, by which the highest arts of life and the noblest forms of religion may be developed. The corn-plants require different conditions of growth. The weather that is fatal to the barley and the oats is life to the wheat. The wheat sends its root deep down into the soil, and through this tap-root it sucks up the moisture of these subterranean depths untouched by the sun's rays. Thus, a drought which can burn up the shallow-rooted barley or oats will not affect the wheat, which rejoices in the fiercest heat and produces the best crop in the hottest summer. We thus see that our mixed crops never get weather that suits them all alike. Plants adapt themselves by slow degrees to the climate and soil in which they are placed, and there is at length a complete harmony of correspondence between them. But we cultivate a number of different plants, with different constitutions and habits, under artificial conditions, and we force them into a brief and sudden correspondence with their environments ; and we do not wonder that there should be at times a disastrous revolt. But it is astonishing nevertheless how the different kinds of corn-plants under our changeable skies yield to us season after season a more or less average crop.

The corn needs to hear our prayer year after year ; for God has so arranged the supply of our food that the annual harvest of the world will only suffice for the world's annual necessities. There never was a two years' supply, or even

a year and a half's supply, of the first necessary of life at one time in the world. Every year the barrel of meal is nearly exhausted, and no new supply can be obtained except from the fields that are slowly ripening under the patient heavens. As we approach the season of harvest every year the starvation, which is often within a day's march of multitudes of the human family, is within a few weeks of all. All the other riches in the world, being based upon the riches of the harvest-fields, were as worthless as the notes of the banker without the real goods to represent them. And in having year after year to sow and reap our fields, and in thus having our daily bread measured out to us, and our daily bread only, we are taught in the most impressive way the solemn lesson of our entire dependence upon God.

We have thus examined link after link of the remarkable chain of Nature and Providence described in the poetry of Hosea ; and the conviction is forced upon us, that it is God who hears not only the heavens and the earth and the corn when they call, but each one of us when we cry, " Give us this day our daily bread." It is He who, by the operations of natural law, makes the earth yield her fruit every year, so that there may be abundance for man and beast. It is He who, by the operations of laws of social economy—by the trades of the farmer and the miller and the merchant—brings our loaf of bread ready to our table every day. All these things are done by intermediate agencies—by the powers of Nature and the energies of man ; but the entire process is superintended and controlled and harmonized by the God of Nature and of Providence, who is, indeed, God over all, blessed for ever. And the Lord's Prayer teaches us, by the petition for daily bread, coming fourth in the series, that it is only when we hallow the name of the great Father of all, and do what we can to make His kingdom come and His will be done on earth as it is in heaven, that we have a

right to ask for the due supply of our needed food and the assurance that we shall enjoy it. "Let the people praise Thee, O God; let all the people praise Thee. Then shall the earth yield her increase; and God, even our own God, shall bless us."

When the prophet says that the lowest link of the chain is Jezreel—"and they shall hear Jezreel"—he puts us in mind of the strange significance of that name. Jezreel was originally the name of the most fertile part of Palestine, the great granary and corn-field of the Holy Land, the plain of Esdraelon. It then passed to the city which Ahab and Jezebel made their capital, and polluted with the foul worship of Baal, and which, on that account, became accursed and was destroyed with a terrible vengeance by Jehu. But at last the accursed spot of the ancient dynasty drew down upon itself the Divine compassion; and the prophet Hosea was commanded by God to call his innocent child by the name of Jezreel, in token that he should live to see God's vengeance upon the house of Jehu for his ruthless cruelty, and that the name of the city and place which he destroyed should go back to its original signification, as derived from the beauty and fertility of the rich corn-plain of Palestine, and be a pledge of the revived beauty and richness of Israel. "I will hear, saith the Lord; I will hear the heavens, and they shall hear the earth; and the earth shall hear the corn and the wine and the oil; and they shall hear Jezreel." The lowest link in the chain of blessing is the old idolatrous city which God had destroyed because of its wickedness. He hears its cry of repentance, and He restores it, and brings back its abundance and prosperity; and because it does the will of God, all things work together for its good.

And is that old act of mercy not full of precious significance to us? The lowest link in the chain by which our yearly harvests are produced is sinful man. We have sinned against God's mercies; we are unworthy of the least of them;

we deserve destruction from the presence of the Lord. We have done the very thing which drew down judgment upon Jezreel. We have worshipped the powers of Nature—the Baal-god of material resources—and forgotten the Hand that has been feeding us. But notwithstanding He makes His sun to shine upon the just and the unjust, and His rain to fall upon the evil and the good. We, sinful, unworthy as we are, cry to the corn, and the corn cries to the earth, and the earth cries to the heavens, and the heavens cry to God, and God hears and sends us our daily bread day by day, that His goodness and longsuffering may lead us to repentance. Let us remember that we are kept in life by the forbearing mercy and undeserved goodness of God for two reasons—first, that we may turn from our sins to the love of God in Christ Jesus our Saviour, and then that we may serve Him and help to carry on His blessed work in the world. It is for this that the wonderful chain of natural blessings exists. And if by this chain of earthly blessings that concern our bodies our souls climb up to God's grace in Christ Jesus, then we shall lay hold of that still higher and more wonderful chain of spiritual benefits, link by link, and realize that He forgiveth all our iniquities ; He healeth all our diseases ; He redeemeth our life from destruction ; He crowneth us with loving-kindness and tender mercies ; He satisfieth our mouth with good things ; He reneweth our youth like the eagle's, all of which are yea and amen in Christ Jesus to the glory of the Father. And we shall pass upwards successively by the links of the golden chain which reaches from earth to heaven ; “for whom He did foreknow He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son ; moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called ; and whom He called, them He also justified ; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.” In the case of each of us, may the chain of Providence, by which our daily bread is secured to us, lead us to lay hold

of the spiritual chain by which we shall obtain the meat that endureth unto everlasting life !

“O Thou, out-topping all we know or think,
Far off yet nigh, out-reaching all we see,
Hold Thou my hand, that so the topmost link
Of the great chain may hold from us to Thee;

And from my heaven-touched life, may downward flow
Prophetic promise of a grace to be;
And flower, and bird, and beast may upward grow,
And find their highest linked to God in me.”

HUGH MACMILLAN.

INTERPRETATION OF ROMANS VIII. 33, 34.

AMONG the minor questions of New Testament exegesis, there is no one which is more interesting than that which bears upon the proper punctuation and translation of this passage. The first inquiry which occurs is: Are the words, *Θεὸς ὁ δικαίων*, to be viewed as affirmative or interrogative? and is the rendering consequently to be, “It is God that justifieth,” or “Shall it be God that justifieth?” If the former view be accepted, the words are to be regarded as an affirmative answer to the challenge contained in the previous clause of the verse; if the second be preferred, the words must be taken as a virtual *reductio ad absurdum*—a strong interrogative answer to the preceding question, implying the utter impossibility of entertaining for a moment the idea suggested by the opening clause of the verse.

And next, according as the one or the other of these views is adopted with respect to the clause referred to, will almost certainly be the conclusion reached in regard to the remaining portion of the verse. The interrogation, *τίς ὁ κατακρίνων*, will, in one case, be regarded as affirmatively

answered by the statement, "It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Or, in the other case, the reply will, as before, be viewed as contained in an additional question, which utterly scouts the possibility of such a thing as condemnation happening to God's people, and the translation will then run as follows: "Who is he that condemneth? Is it Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us?"

On looking back upon the history of the interpretation of the passage, we are perhaps warranted in saying that opinion has been pretty equally divided among commentators as to the two views which have been stated. This has, at least, been the case until recent years, when Biblical critics have, for the most part, been found inclining to that rendering of the verses which is contained in our Authorised Version. Since Dean Alford published his commentary, in which he departed from what had become the prevailing view, there have been very few writers on the Epistle who have followed on the same side. Many have taken no notice of the question at all. Others have decidedly preferred the common opinion, and have barely admitted the possibility of the alternative rendering. The Revised Version may be regarded as, more or less, representing such critics, for it adheres to the ordinary view in the text, while it assigns the other a place on the margin.

The only decided expression of opinion which I have met with, in recent commentaries on the Epistle, in favour of the second view mentioned above, is given by Mr. Moule, in *The Expositor's Bible*. With fine exegetical tact (if my judgment in the matter is worth anything), he says, in a note on the verses, "We adopt the interrogative rendering of all the clauses here. It is equally good in grammar, and

far more congenial to the glowing context." It is to the illustration and confirmation of this view that I wish to devote the present paper. And I shall begin with some general remarks on the phraseology of the New Testament writers, which will by-and-by receive a special application.

It appears to me, then, that the purely Hellenic factor has never yet had sufficient weight assigned to it in considering the style of the various human authors of the New Testament. There has even existed a prevalent habit of asserting that the Jews, in the times of Christ and His Apostles, hated all that was Greek. This is a totally erroneous opinion. It is opposed to all that we learn from the best and most ancient Rabbinic sources. We meet, for instance, with such statements as the following, which are quoted by Dr. Hamburger from the most trustworthy Jewish authorities: "The patriarch Rabbi Juda i. thus admonished his readers, 'What is the need of the Syrian tongue in Palestine? use either the Hebrew or the Greek.' 'The Law must be translated only into Greek, for only in that language can it be perfectly rendered.' 'The Greek language may be used for everything.'"¹ To the same effect, Dr. Tholuck has shown how highly those Rabbis, who were, as nearly as possible, contemporaries of Christ, esteemed the Greek language; and how carefully they studied Greek writers. He sums up his statements on the subject by saying that "the Greek language was prized as the medium of public intercourse and of literature, while the Grecian authors were studied by the Rabbis, and their writings were even made the express subjects of instruction."²

In full accordance with these representations are the undoubted facts which meet us in the New Testament.

¹ *Real-Encyclop. für Bibel und Talmud.* Arts. "Unterricht," and "Griechenthum."

² *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer.* Dritt. Kap.

No one, for instance, who was not conversant with the Greek classical writers, could have composed the preface to St. Luke's Gospel. Its style is so remarkably pure that we might almost imagine it to have been written by the pen of Thucydides. So again, the Epistle to the Hebrews (who-soever may have been its author) betrays unmistakable signs, in the flow of its periods, and the general character of its diction, that the writer possessed an acquaintance with the great models of Greek composition. Nor is it scarcely possible to believe that the Epistle of St. James, with its accuracy and sparkle, could have been the production of any one who was not acquainted with the Attic poets and historians. Critics have vied with each other in their expressions of admiration for the Greek of this Epistle. Thus, to quote only two out of a multitude, Credner declares that "the author exhibits a delicate acquaintance with the Greek language"; while Winer speaks of the Epistle as being written "in a style of choice, or, it may even be said, exquisite Greek." All this clearly points to a familiarity with the works of the best Greek writers.

But we are, if possible, still surer of our ground when we now turn to St. Paul. We know that his birthplace, Tarsus, was a thoroughly Greek city—in fact, a very citadel of Hellenism, where the language and literature of Greece were firmly established. Moreover, we have plain and direct evidence of the Apostle's acquaintance with the classical writers. Three quotations from them appear in the Epistles which bear his name. The first occurs in his celebrated speech at Athens (*Acts* xvii. 28), and consists of these words from the *Φαινόμενα* of Aratus,—*Τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν*—"For we are also his offspring." The second quotation is found at 1 *Corinthians* xv. 33, where the following Iambic trimeter is cited from the *Thais* of Menander, but, as some have thought, is ultimately traceable to Euripides—*Φθείρουσιν ἥθη χρῆσθ' ὀμιλῖαι κακαί*—"Evil

communications corrupt good manners." The remaining quotation is found at *Titus* i. 12, and is probably from Epimenides, a Cretan poet, though some have referred it to a later writer, Callimachus of Alexandria. It consists of the following Hexameter verse—*Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θηρία, γαστέρες ἀργαί*—"The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies."

Now, it would be obviously absurd to suppose that, in such a city as Tarsus, the Apostle's knowledge of the Greek writers could be limited to those whom he has happened to quote. He, doubtless, had access to the whole range of classical literature. And, that being granted, as common sense requires it should be, the special point which I wish to make is this: that there is a striking similarity, to some extent, between the Apostle's style and that of Demosthenes. I do not, of course, deny that there are many marked differences between them; but what I wish to maintain, and to use as a clue to the correct interpretation of the passage before us, is that there is also, in some respects, and in *one* especially, a remarkable likeness. The very terms in which St. Paul's critics of old described his Epistles (2 *Cor.* x. 10), when they styled them *βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραί*, "weighty and powerful," will serve, perhaps as well as any others, to characterise the speeches of the great Greek orator. And, conversely, when Cicero says (*De Orat.* iii. 28), "*Vim* Demosthenes habuit," and when Quintilian (*Instit.*, x. 1, 76) makes use of the expression "*vis*" as specially descriptive of the merits of Demosthenes, a term is selected which may, with equal justice, be applied to St. Paul's Epistles. This Latin word *vis* corresponds to the Greek expression *δεινότης*, which denotes *energy and impressiveness*, and these qualities are strikingly illustrated in the extant writings alike of St. Paul as of Demosthenes.

But now, to approach more closely the subject immediately in hand, I observe specially that the Apostle imitates

the Greek orator in this respect,—that he is fond of expressing a strong negation *by means of an interrogation*. Let us first see the practice of Demosthenes with regard to this matter. Take *e.g.* the following passage from the *Olynthiacs* (iii. 36). The orator has been inveighing against the foolish course pursued by the Athenians, under the influence of their political advisers, with reference to Philip. “Let any one,” he says, “come forward and tell me by whose means except our own Philip has grown strong.” Then he supposes some person among his hearers to reply to this effect:—*Ἀλλ', ὦ τᾶν, εἰ ταῦτα φαύλως, τά γ' ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ πόλει νῦν ἄμεινον ἔχει*,—“Well, my good sir, though these things look badly, affairs in the city itself at least are better.” Then follows a series of questions implying a strong denial of this assertion, and presenting, I think, a somewhat striking analogy to the passage before us as I interpret it. The orator exclaims,—*Καὶ τί ἂν εἰπεῖν τις ἔχοι; τὰς ἐπάλξεις ἃς κονιῶμεν; καὶ τὰς ὁδοὺς ἃς ἐπισκευάζομεν; καὶ κρήνας καὶ λήρους*;—“What has any one to say in proof of this? The parapets which we whitewash? the roads which we put in order? the fountains and fooleries?” No, no, no, must be the reiterated answer given to these questions; and thus the speaker’s desire of expressing the most vehement denial, in reply to the interrogation first uttered, is accomplished.

Next, let us look at the following passage in the speech of Demosthenes, *De falsa legatione*. The orator has been referring to a certain line of conduct which the king of Persia had adopted with regard to the Athenians, and he argues that Philip of Macedon would have acted, and would still act, in the same way, if their conduct gave him a chance of choosing such a course. His words are,—*Ταῦτο τοῖνυν τοῦτ' ἂν ἐποίησε Φίλιππος, εἴ τινα τούτων εἶδε δίκην δόντα, καὶ νῦν, ἂν ἴδῃ, ποιήσει. Ἐπειδὴν δ' ἀκούῃ λέγοντας, εὐδοκιμοῦντας ἐν ὑμῖν, ἐτέρους κρίνοντας, τί καὶ ποιησῇ; ζητῇ*

πόλλ' ἀναλίσκειν, ἐξὸν ἐλάττω, καὶ πάντας θεραπεύειν βούληται, δὴ ἡ τρεῖς ἐξὸν ; μαίνοιτο μέντ' αὖν,—“ Philip, then, would have done the same, if he had seen any of these men subjected to punishment, and now, if he sees it, he will do so. But when he hears that they are still speaking in your assemblies—that they are held in reputation among you, and that they put others upon trial—what is he to do? Shall he seek to incur great expense, when he may do with less, and show his willingness to pay court to all, when two or three would suffice? Acting thus, he would be mad.” Here again, the strongest negation is evidently involved in the questions which precede the final statement. It was so inconceivable that Philip should adopt the course referred to that, had he really done so, he would have proved himself bereft of reason.

Let us take yet another passage from the same writer's famous oration, *De corona*. It occurs immediately after the celebrated adjuration by those who died at Marathon, Salamis, and other scenes of patriotic devotedness, which were the glory of the Athenians. Addressing Æschines, the great orator exclaims: Ἐμὲ δέ, ὦ τριταγωνιστά, περὶ τῶν πρωτείων σύμβουλον τῇ πόλει παριόντα τὸ τίνος φρόνημα λαβόντ' ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμ' ἔδει ; τὸ τοῦ τούτων ἀνάξια ἐροῦντος ; δικαίως μέντ' αὖν ἀπέθανον,—“ O you mere third-rate performer, when I was in my place to counsel the State how to retain her pre-eminence, in what spirit did it behove me to mount the rostrum? Was it in the spirit of one offering counsel unworthy of these my countrymen? In that case, I should justly have suffered death.” Demosthenes here declares that such conduct as is suggested in the question he puts, was so utterly abhorrent to his character—so sheerly impossible in any upright citizen—that, could he have conceived himself as being guilty of it, he would have felt righteously condemned to perish.

With these examples before us, let us now inquire

whether or not similar passages are to be found in the writings of St. Paul. They do, in fact, meet us in abundance. We think at once of the Apostle's eloquent apostrophe to death in 1 *Corinthians* xv. 55, when he exclaims : Ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον ; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νίκος. "O death, where is thy sting? O death, where is thy victory?"¹ The obvious force of these questions is that, terrible though death naturally appears, yet, through the operation of God's grace and power, it comes to have *no* sting, and can secure *no* victory.

We may next turn to *Galatians* iv. 16, where we find the words, ὥστε ἐχθρὸς ὑμῶν γέγονα ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν;—"Am I therefore become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" Of course, the meaning of the Apostle is that the very opposite inference from that here suggested should be derived from the fact of his having told them the truth. He wishes emphatically to affirm that, by acting as he had done, so far from having shown them any hostility or ill-will, he had proved himself the true friend of these Galatians.

We shall look only at one passage more, and it is found at 2 *Corinthians* vi. 14-16. The words are : Μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις· τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀνομία ; ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος ; τίς δὲ συμφώνησις Χριστοῦ πρὸς Βελίαλ ; ἢ τίς μερὶς πιστῶ μετὰ ἀπίστου ; τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῶ Θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων ;—"Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers : for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity ? or what communion hath light with darkness ? And what concord hath Christ with Belial ? or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever ? And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols ?" The object of this passage clearly is to affirm, with all possible earnestness, that there can be *no* fellowship between righteousness

¹ I have given the Revisers' reading, though by no means certain of its superior claims to that of the A.V. For our present purpose it matters not which of the rival texts is accepted.

and iniquity, *no* communion of light with darkness, *no* concord between Christ and Belial, and *no* agreement between a temple of God and idols.

I am, of course, far from maintaining that the idiom we have been considering is to be found only in the writings of Demosthenes and St. Paul. It occurs frequently in other authors, both secular and sacred, as might very easily be shown. But what I venture to affirm is, that it is so common in the great orator of Athens and the great Apostle of the Gentiles, that it may be regarded as one of the characteristics of their style, and thus forms a phraseological tie which binds the literary productions of the one to those of the other.

And now let us view the passage under our eye in the light of all that has been stated. When we do so, and bear in mind that St. Paul here evidently wishes to deny as strongly as words will enable him, that any charge can be brought against God's elect, we are surely warranted in believing that in this, as in so many other passages, the Apostle has recourse to his favourite questionary form in order to express strong negation, and asks with a kind of sublime and sacred irony: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? Shall it be God that justifieth? Who is he that condemneth? Is it Christ that died, yea, rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us?" This seems to me quite in accordance with the usual practice of St. Paul, and strikingly harmonious with the fervour of spirit which glows and burns throughout the latter half of this chapter. It is also worthy of notice that this interpretation brings the verses before us into analogy with verse 36 immediately following, in which verse the question, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?" is answered only, but very effectively, by a series of other questions.

I may now remark that the view of the passage before us

for which I have been pleading, is by no means a mere modern opinion. On the contrary, it was held both by St. Ambrose and St. Augustine among the Fathers, and was maintained by Erasmus at the period of the Reformation.¹ It has, as I have already hinted, failed to win the assent of the majority of modern commentators. Some of them, indeed, have expressed themselves very strongly against it. Philippi, for instance, says that "apart from all else, the question whether God who justifies will accuse, which is meant to repel with still greater force the possibility of accusation on the part of any one whatever, contains, at least to our taste, nothing but an unwarranted subtlety or intolerable irony." But, notwithstanding such opposition, the view which has been supported in this paper will, I believe, yet revive in favour, and will ultimately be accepted as the only satisfactory explanation of the passage.

It deserves here to be briefly noticed how tenaciously the late Archbishop Whately adhered to the interrogative rendering of all the clauses in the verses under consideration. A friend who visited him when very near his end writes as follows:—"The Sunday before his death he seemed unconscious, and I read Romans viii. (a chapter for which he had asked more than once during his illness) by his side, not being quite sure, however, that he could hear or notice it. Instinctively I read verses 33, 34 as he had taught me to do on a previous visit: 'Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? *Is it* God that justifieth? Who is he that condemneth? *Is it* Christ that died?' etc. The eyes of the dying man opened for a moment. 'That is quite right,' he whispered.'" ²

Whichever of the alternative renderings of this passage is

¹ To some extent, at least, for his paraphrase of the words, Θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν, is—"Num audiet calumniatorem adversus eos, quibus ipse gratis omnia commissa condonavit?"

² *Life of Dr Whately*, by his daughter, ii. 440.

adopted, no one can fail to perceive the wealth of divine consolation which it conveys to every true follower of Christ." "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" is the bold challenge uttered by St. Paul in the face of an intelligent universe. And, on listening to it, the mind naturally thinks, in the first place, of God as the supreme Judge of all. Some such words as those of the Psalmist will suggest themselves to the heart, when he exclaimed (*Ps. cxliii*, 2), "Enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." As Bishop Horne remarks on this statement:—"The thoughts of such a trial are enough to appal the soul of the best man living, to make his flesh tremble, and all his bones shake, as if he stood at the foot of Sinai, and beheld Jehovah ready to break forth upon him, in the flame of devouring fire." But the Apostle has a most effective means of dispelling all such terrors, and of vindicating the lofty position which he has assumed. He reveals God as Himself standing in the relation of *ὁ δικαιῶν* towards His people: as a Saviour He has already justified them; and therefore there is the utmost certainty that never can they be brought by Him into condemnation.

But again, on hearing St. Paul's challenge, our thoughts may turn to Christ, inasmuch as we read, "The Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." Here also, however, the Apostle furnishes abundant reasons for dismissing all the fears which might thus be engendered. For, first, "Christ died"—died for the sins of His people, thus obtaining "eternal redemption" for them, and so wiping out their guilt for ever. But, further and better, having "died for their sins, He rose again for their justification." His resurrection was the seal and evidence of the victory He had gained on their behalf. And yet more: He is now exalted as their representative to the right hand of God, and is still mindful of their interests,

for, adds St. Paul, "He also maketh intercession for us." Whatever their wants, He lives to supply them; whatever their weakness, He is able to furnish them with divine strength; whatever the conflicts in which they are called to engage, they must at last through Him prove "more than conquerors." The arch of victory is thus complete; no accusation can be sustained against the justified: God, with all His attributes of power, justice, and holiness is on their side; and thus, as the Apostle has declared in the opening verse of this chapter, there is absolutely "no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus."

A. ROBERTS.

THE OLDEST CHRISTIAN SERMON.

(HEBREWS III. AND IV.)

UP to the present time but one passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews has been brought under suspicion of being an addition to the original epistle. It is the passage at the close, where Overbeck (*Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, 1880, p. 15 f.), Lipsius (*Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1881, p. 359 ff.), and W. Brückner (*Die chronologische Reihenfolge in welcher die Briefe des Neuen Testaments verfasst sind*, 1890, p. 36, 248, note 1; cf. also Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, II., 1, 2, 1882, p. 105 f., and *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, ³I., 1894, p. 345 f., 441) have proposed striking out xiii. 22–25; while Weizsäcker (*Das apostolische Zeitalter der christlichen Kirche*, 1892, p. 473) rejects as an interpolation even verses 18–24; and K. R. Köstlin ("Ueber den Hebräerbrief," in *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1854, p. 433, note 1) suggested that verse 23 was an interpolation, introduced for the purpose of claiming Pauline authorship for the letter. In reply to Köstlin's argument one has but to ask why the interpolator did not make his object clearer; and the same objection holds against the first-mentioned view, according to which the whole conclusion is supposed to have been added for this same purpose.¹ Moreover, as Von Soden ("Der Hebräerbrief" in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1884, p. 436 ff.) has shown, these verses, even if we suppose the epistle to have been written after A.D. 70, contain nothing else to arouse suspicion and are doubtless genuine.

On the other hand, an introduction to the epistle must have originally existed and have fallen away (cf. the refer-

¹ This objection is valid also against the proposal to refer the "epistola ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine fincta ad hæresem Marcionis" (*Fragm. Murat.*, 64f.) to our Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Holtzmann, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, ³1892, p. 294, note 1; Zahn, *Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons*, 1888, I., p. 288; Kuhn, *Das Muratorische Fragment*, 1892, p. 83.

ences given in Holtzmann's *Einleitung*, p. 303). Von Soden's hypothesis (p. 651 f.) of an original encyclical address, which was left out in their copies by the several churches, and so has perished, has no support in the epistle itself, not even in xiii. 24. For if the epistle was addressed only to the Church in Rome, it could very well be that οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, who lived in the same place where the writer was then staying, or who had fled thither for fear of an extension of the persecution beyond the limits of Rome, should send greetings to the honoured and at the moment sorely oppressed Church of the capital.

Except, however, for the falling away of the address with the name of Rome, no one has yet shown that our λόγος παρακλήσεως is not preserved in its original form.

We cannot, however, expect the unity of the epistle to remain long thus uncontroverted. When the Pauline epistles have been completely dissected by the Dutch critics, the Epistle to the Hebrews will no doubt meet the same fate; for there is no lack of starting points for theories of composition. Von Soden (p. 655) has suggested that the chief part of the epistle may consist of homilies of the author. Many passages in chapters vii.-x. could be omitted without hurting the connection of thought. Especially have ii. 1-4, iii. 6-iv. 13, and v. 11-vi. 20, long been felt to interrupt the progress of the thought (Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, p. 292 f.). But the case in the first and third of these passages is different from that in the second.

ii. 1-4 follows naturally upon chapter i., and is necessary in order to explain the mention of the angels; for this mention is made, not by way of a polemic against Essene worship of angels (as Pfeiderer, *Das Urchristentum*, 1887, p. 626, 631, still thinks), but the argument is directed against the service of the Law, which in ii. 2 is referred to the angels. Likewise after the exhortation to hold fast to that which was heard the writer proceeds, quite to the point: "For not unto angels

did God subject the world to come, but unto Christ." (Further, see Kurtz, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 1869, p. 89.)

Again, the third of the three above-mentioned passages comes at a point where the writer has, for the first time, formulated his theme, and so had occasion to halt for an instant and urge his readers with threatenings to special attention. In the same way the passage beginning in chapter vii., and treating of the superiority of Christ over the Old Testament high priests, is a thoroughly suitable foundation for the great description of the Christian hope as a sure and stedfast anchor in all the storms of life (vi. 19), but is hardly suited to give a reason for the exaltation of Christ through His suffering (v. 7 ff. ; cf. ii. 10).

These two passages, therefore (ii. 1-4 and v. 11-vi. 20), cannot be separated from the context, however much they may at first look like digressions.

Quite otherwise is the case with iii. 7-iv. 13, which Weiss (*Handbuch über den Brief an die Hebräer*, 1888, p. 99 ; cf. also Von Soden, *Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament*, III. 2, ²1892, p. 33) has called "a homily on Psalm xcv." Chapter iii. 7, it is true, connects with what precedes without any seam, but iv. 14, where a new paragraph is often very properly made to begin, refers back, as the commentators say, to ii. 17, or, in other words, stands in no connection whatever with what precedes, or even with iii. 1-6. Calvin (*In omnes Pauli apostoli epistolas commentarii*, 1831, II., pp. 403, 416) saw fully the difficulty, and tried to show that iii. 1-6 is a representation of Christ as *apostolus* and *doctor*, in contrast with which stands the description of Him from iv. 14 on as *sacerdos*. But this interpretation has been, so far as I can find, abandoned by all later exegetes, and the last important commentator on Hebrews, Westcott (*The Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1889, p. 72) remarks that chapters iii. and iv. form a digression. Let us examine this statement more closely.

In the first place, iii. 1 does not, as Tholuck (*Commentar zum Brief an die Hebräer*, 1850, pp. 132, 202) thinks, mean "therefore hold fast to the confession," which would make a suitable sequel to ii. 17 f., but "consider the apostle and high priest of our confession, Jesus Christ." This "considering" might have a practical aim, as in xii. 2, but, in fact, although Calvin (p. 403) thinks otherwise, what follows shows that it is to have a theoretical purpose. But if the verse is thus not a practical exhortation, but a rhetorical form for the sake of keeping up the readers' interest (cf. Von Soden, *Handcommentar*, p. 7), it is quite impossible that it should be connected by *ὁθεν* with what precedes. For, in spite of the repetition of *πιστός*, from the dignity of a merciful and faithful high priest there does not follow (at any rate in any such direct way as that in which the incarnation follows from the need of redemption on the part of the *σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ*) fidelity to his Creator, but the fidelity to the Creator is a second and different point, in addition to the first (cf. Westcott, p. 56 f.). Moreover, the designation *ἀποστολος* for Jesus, although it may to be sure be regarded as prepared for (not, as Von Soden, p. 8, thinks, by i. 4-14, but) by ii. 3 (Kurtz, p. 115; cf. Delitzsch, *Commentar zum Brief an die Hebräer*, 1857, p. 103), occurs nowhere else in the Epistle, and the address, *ἀδελφοί*, which here might be suggested by ii. 11 ff. (Bengel, *Gnomon N. T.*, 1860, p. 569; Westcott, p. 73), does not occur, except in iii. 12, until the practical part of the Epistle, x. 19, xiii. 22. The word *οἶκος*, too, is used in different senses in the practical part and in our passage. In x. 21 occurs the expression *ἱερεὺς μέγας ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ Θεοῦ*, with reference to Jesus, and we are compelled by the preceding *ἀγα*, and by the whole connection, to take *οἶκος* of the heavenly house of God, although Weiss (p. 263 f.) is led by iii. 6 to think of the earthly house. In iii. 6 the earthly house is indeed meant, for Moses is said to have been a faithful servant in it, and, according to ch. ix.,

the earthly high priests, and therefore Moses as well, were associated only with the first tabernacle. Is it, however, probable that in the same piece of writing the expression should be used in two senses which cannot possibly be harmonized? (This in opposition to Delitzsch, p. 487 f.) One might appeal to the double sense in which the author has used *σκηνή*, but in these cases *ἀληθινή* (viii. 2) or *μείζων καὶ τελεωτέρα οὐ χειροποίητος* is added, so that in xiii. 10 *σκηνή* standing alone must refer to the Jewish sanctuary. (This in opposition to Ritschl, "Über die Leser des Hebräerbriefs," in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1866, p. 97; Von Hofmann, *Der Schriftbeweis*, ² II. 1, 1858, pp. 185, 457; Kurtz, p. 423; Zahn, art. "Hebräerbrief," in *Herzog's Realencyclopädie*, ² V., 1879, p. 662; Von Soden, pp. 13, 101 f.) But even if that double use of *οἶκος Θεοῦ* were conceivable, is it not wholly superfluous for the author, after having shown the superiority of Jesus to the angels, to go on to show that He is superior to Moses? ¹ Moreover, this idea of the superiority of Jesus to Moses is not used at all in what follows, for the connexion which Theophylact, Westcott, and Von Soden have tried to prove between ch. iii. 1-6, and ch. v. sqq. does not really exist. Von Soden has also tried, unsuccessfully, to show that ch. xiii. takes account of ch. iii. and iv. But before taking up the main portion of these chapters, let me speak of the verses which follow the homily.

That iv. 14 has no connexion at all with what precedes, has already been shown, and is generally admitted. ² But

¹ This holds also as a reply to Westcott (p. 72). This comparison is an essential part of the argument; for though the superiority of Christ to Moses might have seemed to be necessarily implied in the superiority of Christ to angels, yet the position of Moses in regard to the actual Jewish system made it necessary, in view of the difficulty of Hebrew Christians, to develop the truth independently—for the angels were mentioned only on account of their relation to the Law. The passage from Jalkut on Isaiah lii. 13, quoted by Delitzsch (p. 107 n. 1) is no parallel, for the argument follows the logical order: The servant of Jehovah, the King Messiah, is higher than Abraham, more exalted than Moses, more exalted than the ministering angels.

² Cf. especially Keil, *Commentar über den Brief an die Hebräer*, 1885, p. 12,

it is also noticeable that v. 16 repeats v. 14, and that the three verses 14–16 contain nothing that has not been said already in the Epistle. (Cf. iv. 14 with vi. 18, 20, x. 19 sqq.; iv. 15 with ii. 17 sq., v. 2, vii. 15, ix. 28; iv. 16 with vi. 11, x. 19, 22, 35).

Finally, and this is the most important point, all connexion is lacking between iv. 16 and v. 1. For that every high priest is taken from among men because he can contemplate sinners dispassionately (and that is the main thought of verse 1 f.) can never be the ground of exhortation to draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace. For we cannot pass over verse 16 and make the γάρ go back to verse 15, because in that case v. 1 ought to read: πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος μετριοπαθεῖν δύναται τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν κ.τ.λ. (This is in opposition to Tholuck, p. 242; Kurtz, p. 172; Westcott, p. 117; and Weiss, p. 129.) Von Hofmann (p. 280 ff.) and Delitzsch (p. 170 ff.) make the γάρ govern grammatically only vv. 1–3, but “logically” (!) the whole section vv. 1–10, and treat verse 7f. as an answer corresponding to the requirement in verses 1–3. Riehm (*Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs*, 1858 f., p. 447, xx.) thinks that in verses 1–3, at least as a secondary idea, the presence in Christ of this capacity for μετριοπάθεια is indicated. Even that, however, is not really in the passage; the verses are intended merely to show that Christ did not wilfully seize upon the high priesthood. (Verse 4: cf. Bleek, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, III., 1840, p. 28; Weiss, p. 135; Von Soden, p. 40; a different view in Kurtz, p. 175.) That being the case, the application to Christ of what is said in verses 1–3 about the Aaronic high priest is certainly wanting. In iv. 15 the application was only indicated, but it had been made in full in ii. 17 f. From

n. 1. Ch. iv. 14 16 cannot be brought in respect either of contents or form into harmonious connexion with the preceding exhortation to enter into God's rest.

this point of view we can understand the emphasis with which ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος is put first. This is a second time emphasized with reference to the earthly high priest, in the case of whom it really goes without saying, because just before, in ii. 14, 17, it had been demonstrated that it was necessary for the Son of God to become man and to be subject to suffering. It was necessary for Him to become like us in all respects in order that He might have compassion,—for in the same way every high priest is taken from among men, because then he can contemplate sinners dispassionately.

Thus iii. 1–6 and iv. 14–16 are shown by reasons drawn from the composition and the contents to be alien to the context; and this is especially true of the homily which lies between these two passages.

For this homily certainly implies other conditions than those to be inferred from the rest of the Epistle. Even if ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ζώντος, iii. 12, can be used of apostasy to Judaism, as, in view of ix. 14, xii. 22, seems at least not impossible,¹ yet in general this homily insists, in an almost Methodistic fashion, on conversion, while the rest of the Epistle exhorts to a conservative holding fast to the confession. But if not on the same occasion, yet at different times, the two thoughts might be emphasized by the same writer, for the style in general, and the not perfectly exact use of the LXX. and of Philo in particular, are the same in both pieces. Perhaps the attitude towards Judaism is

¹ Nevertheless it is comprehensible that, especially on the ground of this passage, Von Soden (p. 10), Pfeiderer (p. 625), Weizsäcker (p. 492) think that apostasy to heathenism is meant in the Epistle; while Zahn (p. 661) and Keil (p. 18) think at least of a Judaism without faith and hope, and Häring ("Zur Frage nach dem Zweck und Leserkreis des Hebräerbriefs," in *Studien und Kritiken*, 1891, p. 595) of a speculative Judaism. If the passage can really not be understood as an anti-Judaistic polemic, then, instead of constructing *ad hoc* with Pfeiderer (p. 626) an ascetical and mystical Syncretism, it would be necessary to hold with Weizsäcker (p. 474 f.), that different aims are present in the Epistle; or, since the rest shows no disharmony, to cut out chapters 3 and 4.

more friendly in chapters iii. and iv. than in the rest of the Epistle; but even the latter is not uniform in this respect, as the varying presentations of the thought of the Epistle show.¹

Finally, it cannot be proved that the two chapters were unknown to the later Christian writers who used the Epistle. They must therefore have been inserted later by the author himself.

That this often happened in ancient writings with short remarks is well known,² and it has been assumed for some passages of the Pauline epistles, especially by Witting, Gratz, Wilke, Renan, Laurent, Kuoke.³ There is a considerable passage, §§ 12 and 13, in the tract which bears Philo's name, "*Quod omnis probus liber,*" which Ohle (*Jahrbücher für prot. Theologie*, 1837, p. 298 ff., 376 ff.), with

¹ Cf. on the one side Köstlin, p. 466: "The author controverts the holiness and value of the Law just as far as is possible without breaking the connexion of Old and New Testament revelation." Immer, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 1877, p. 405: "Nevertheless the difference is radical." Davidson, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, 2^d L., 1882, p. 201 f.: "The view of Christianity and Judaism is determined by the Alexandrine conception of the supersensuous world. . . . The present world or æon was that which preceded Christianity; the future world or æon is that of Christianity itself. . . . The two are metaphysically opposed to one another." Brückner, p. 227: "Judaism is in every respect the incomplete type and copy; Christianity, on the other hand, at least in its proper nature and its ideal worth, the complete and veritable prototype"; p. 225: "The author's principle is to emphasize in every respect the complete contrast between the old and the new covenant." On the other side, Reuss, *Histoire de la Théologie Chrétienne au Siècle Apostolique*, 1852, II. p. 556: "L'Épître aux Hébreux ne connaît pas l'autithèse entre la foi et la loi. Elle paraît plutôt se borner à reconnaître entre les deux dispensations une différence de degré ou de progrès, et dans la seconde une nouvelle phase d'évolution par laquelle il ne resterait de la première que le cadre extérieur sans la réalité du contenu." Schmiedel, *Quæ intercedat ratio inter doctrinam epistolæ ad Hebræos missæ et Pauli apostoli doctrinam*, p. 13: "Non natura sua atque ingenio, sed gradu differunt." Pfeleiderer, *Paulinismus*, 2^d 1890, p. 375: "The Epistle to the Hebrews represents Judaism as in the positive relation to Christianity of a preparatory institution, an earlier copy." And especially Weiss, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 2^d 1888, p. 475 ff.

² Cf. Blass in Müller, *Handbuch der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 2^d L., 1892, p. 262.

³ Cf. also the author's essay: *Die Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Briefe*, 1894.

the approval of Kuenen (*Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1887, p. 568, 1889, p. 134), and Tidemann (*ibid.*, 1892, p. 597) has tried to cut out as not genuine, but he has perhaps shown merely that the sections are not part of the original draft. And in other periods of stylistic diffuseness writers have inserted in their works episodes which could be separated, and which in some cases they themselves published separately. I would only call to mind Wordsworth's "Female Vagrant" which was even published before the poem "Guilt and Sorrow," of which it now forms a part, or Immermann's "Oberhof," that single idyll which was worked into the romance *Münchhausen*, but is now usually printed by itself. In the same way the unknown author of the Epistle to the Hebrews seems to me to have worked as an after-thought one of his sermons, the earliest that we have, into his Epistle to the Church in Rome.

CARL CLEMEN.

WENDT'S UNTRANSLATED VOLUME

ON THE TEACHING OF CHRIST.

"BACK to Christ" is the watchword or theology at the present time; and there can be little doubt that the question, what precisely was taught by Christ, will be the most burning theological topic of the first decade of the twentieth century.

It seems an easy thing to discover what Christ taught, or in the four Gospels all His words are contained within a very narrow compass. In other writings stray utterances of His may be discovered, but they are exceedingly rare, and do not in the least modify the general impression of His teaching. The question, however, has been raised: Are we sure that all the words attributed to our Lord in the Gospels are really His; or, as we read, do we require to exercise caution and criticism?

Wendt's well-known book is at present our most detailed and handy account of the teaching of Jesus. But, in true German fashion, Wendt began with a thorough investigation of the record of our Lord's teaching in the Gospels, proceeding on the maxim that you cannot be sure what ideas are to be attributed to anyone till you have ascertained the amount of credit due to the documents in which they are contained. This preliminary volume has not been translated—the publishers apparently believing, perhaps with wisdom, that it would not be acceptable to the British public. But it is a book of three hundred and fifty closely printed pages, and a sketch of its contents will show,

perhaps more clearly than anything else, where advanced scholarship stands at present in relation to this question.

Wendt begins with a description of what he obviously believes to have been the course of the life of Jesus. He says it forms the framework of St. Mark, the oldest of our Gospels.

It is as follows : Jesus at first was neither recognised by others as the Messiah nor expressly known to be such by Himself. He deliberately held back the public proclamation of His Messianic title, and only at a comparatively late period of His career received from His disciples an acknowledgment of His dignity. Not till the very end was at hand did He permit the open acknowledgment of the fact or come forward with a claim to it Himself. St. Mark gives no hint that the Baptist knew or pointed out Jesus as the Messiah. According to his account, John indeed made known that the Messiah was about to appear, but not that Jesus was the Messiah ; and at the baptism the vision of the dove was seen by Jesus alone, as He alone heard the voice by which He was designated the Son of God. St. Mark then describes how, on commencing His public work, Jesus was recognised as the Son of God—that is, the Messiah—only by the demoniacs, whom, however, He sternly forbade to make Him known. The rest of the people, on the contrary, when they beheld His extraordinary works, at first inquired in bewilderment what was the significance of His activity and His person ; and then, when they had had time to think, formed and uttered their opinions about Him—these, however, being such as involved a complete denial of His Messianic dignity or, while acknowledging that He was sent of God, yet withheld the full acknowledgment. St. Mark gives prominence to the scene in which, in contrast with this behaviour of the multitude, the apostles, through the mouth of St. Peter,

gave expression to their conviction that he was the Messiah; and he sets in the fullest light his sense of the importance of this epoch-making incident by making Jesus, from this point onwards, introduce a new element into His teaching—the prediction, namely, of His own sufferings and the sufferings of those who confessed Him. Meantime, however, He sternly forbade the Twelve to make known the conclusion at which they had arrived; and, in accordance with this, the first outside the circle of the Twelve who publicly named Jesus the Son of David—the blind beggar, Bartimæus, at Jericho—was commanded by the apostles to hold his peace. At this point, however, Jesus withdrew the seal of silence and immediately thereafter accepted the Messianic homage of the pilgrims, as He entered Jerusalem. This decided His fate with the hierarchy; and at last, in presence of the high priest, Jesus solemnly claimed the Messianic dignity. St. Mark closes his account of the life of Christ with the story of how the heathen centurion, seeing His behaviour on the cross, exclaimed, “Truly this was the Son of God.”

This, according to St. Mark—and Wendt enthusiastically adopts it—was the outline of Christ's life; but, strange to say, the evangelist does not adhere to it himself. It is only by piecing certain parts together from his Gospel that you ascertain that this was the real course of events. These pieces, we can yet see, were originally joined; for the ending of one runs into the opening of the next, when what comes between in the actual St. Mark is removed. The evangelist has allowed the historical outline to be crossed and blurred by a series of accounts of conflicts between Jesus and the hierarchy. This section also is cut up into fragments, which are scattered over the Gospel; but in the same way we can see, from the endings and beginnings of the different parts, that they originally formed a single whole. There is a third series, treated in the

same way, which consists of passages setting forth the necessity and the value of suffering. And there are two other smaller series, which need not be further particularised.

Wendt does not hold that these different series of passages were different documents, which St. Mark incorporated in his narrative: the stamp of the same authorship is too unmistakably on them all for this. He falls back on the old statement of Papias: that St. Mark derived his information from St. Peter: and he believes that these series represent different discourses of St. Peter, or different groups of reminiscences which the apostle was in the habit of delivering together in St. Mark's hearing. Thus there was one discourse in which St. Peter used to give the historical framework of Christ's life; then there was another in which he used to give a collection of anecdotes illustrative of the witty and pithy replies wherewith Jesus confounded opponents; and there was a series of sayings, enclosed within an outline of incident, in which were predicted the sufferings certain to follow the confession of Christ; and so on. St. Mark had these separately in his mind, but he had to combine them into a book; and, not being a man of letters, he did it clumsily; and criticism has to take the patchwork asunder and restore the pieces to the places which they occupied as they came from the lips of St. Peter.

Observe this, however: these Petrine reminiscences do not make up the whole of St. Mark's Gospel. The evangelist incorporated other materials, derived from sources to us unknown but scarcely likely to be of the same dignity. And it is noteworthy that among the additions Wendt reckons some of the greatest miracles of our Lord—such as the Stilling of the Storm and the Feeding of the Five Thousand.

Wendt's treatment of the Gospel of St. John is of a startling character, but it is carried through with great boldness and ability. He discerns in this Gospel two totally distinct hands, not to speak of a third, to which the last chapter is due.

One of the writers is St. John himself. Wendt believes that the apostle was persuaded in his old age to collect his reminiscences, and these form the substance of the present Gospel. They consisted chiefly of sayings and discourses, perhaps bound together by a few slight threads of narrative; but no attempt was made by the apostle to give a connected life of Christ. This attempt was, however, made and carried through by a disciple of St. John, who incorporated the reminiscences of his master with his own ideas and fitted the whole within a historical framework.

In proof that the bulk of the Fourth Gospel is due to St. John, Wendt adduces the words of the Prologue—which, by the way, is not the work of the editor, but the apostle—“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.” Further, the language throughout is that of a Hebrew, who had been brought up on the Septuagint. Especially by the sovereign way in which he makes Jesus handle the Old Testament the writer shows that he must have been in the closest touch with the Lord. It is true, there is a wide discrepancy between the language in which he makes his Master speak and that in which Jesus is made to speak in the Synoptists; but this is sufficiently accounted for by the powerfully developed spiritual individuality of the apostle; and the difference is confined to the form of Christ's words: it does not extend to the substance, which is identical with that found in the Synoptists. Of this Wendt has given detailed proof in the second—that is, the translated—part of his work. So, John has a peculiar vocabulary; but its leading

catchwords are simply equivalents for the leading catchwords of the Synoptists; and the circle of Christ's teaching in St. John, when laid above the circle found in the Synoptists, corresponds with it point by point, although, of course, at some points St. John is more expansive and goes deeper.

Wendt's account of the other writer whose hand is discernible in the Fourth Gospel is a severe one. He expressly exonerates him, indeed, from deliberate falsification; but short of this there is nothing of which the bungler is not capable.

He has entirely obliterated the historicity of the career of Jesus, as criticism is able to exhibit it by judicious excerpts from St. Mark. This career began in obscurity; for a long time Christ performed His acts of healing in secret and suppressed every allusion to His Messiahship; the confession of the Twelve that He was the Messiah was the great crisis; thereafter only did Jesus venture to speak of His sufferings and death; and only towards or at the very end did He permit the Messianic dignity to be ascribed to Him or claim it Himself. The author, however, of the Fourth Gospel in its present form introduces allusions to Christ's sufferings and death from the very first, and takes every opportunity of asseverating that Jesus knew from the beginning that He was to be betrayed by one of the Twelve. In like manner he makes the Baptist recognise Jesus as the Messiah, clean against the representation of St. Mark; and as early as the fourth chapter he makes Jesus Himself say in so many words, "I am the Messiah," to a Samaritan woman. Many, indeed, are represented as denying that He is the Messiah; but allusions to the fact that this is His destiny are numerous from the very commencement of His career.

Even this total oblivion of the true course of the history of Jesus is, however, not the worst. This editor's very conception of Christianity is widely different from that of

Christ, which is faithfully reproduced in his own peculiar dialect by St. John. The latter is deep, inward, mystical; the editor's is external and mechanical. For example, in the portions of the Gospel due to the apostle "eternal life" is a present possession of everyone who believeth on the Son of God; but to the editor it is a possession which is to begin in the next world. And, in the same way, "judgment" is in St. John's mouth or Christ's a process which is proceeding now—everyone who comes into contact with Christ is *ipso facto* judged—but to the editor judgment is a public scene, which will take place at the end of time. The same habit of mind is displayed in the way in which the editor relies on external proofs of the divine origin of Christianity. Jesus Himself rebuked the desire of the Jews for signs and refused to give them; but to the editor the miracles are the commanding evidence, and he has a kind of craze for emphasizing the importance of the testimony of the Baptist.

Unfortunately the editor has mixed up his own additions with the material derived from the apostle so closely that it is no easy task to separate the gold from the alloy. He has even intruded into the Prologue, interrupting its glorious march with two or three irrelevant remarks on his favourite topic of the testimony of John. But Wendt is not discouraged. He goes resolutely through chapter after chapter, and excises now a long paragraph, then a verse or two, here a line and there a word; and he seldom has any hesitation. In the first chapter, for example, he cuts away the whole passage in which the Baptist bears testimony to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, together with the passages thereon ensuing in which St. John and others have their first interview with Jesus amid circumstances which have been supposed to bear marks, tender and unmistakable, of personal recollection. A curious specimen of the results of Wendt's method is found in the

eleventh chapter—the account of the raising of Lazarus. Something proceeding from St. John is here the substratum, but verse by verse it has to be disentangled from the editor's additions. Lazarus had died, and Jesus came a long distance to console the sisters. He naturally talked with them of the certainty that their brother would rise again in the resurrection at the last day; and out of these remarks a story gradually span itself of a resurrection effected by Jesus on the spot; but no such thing really took place.

Wendt is by no means unaware of the reluctance which will be felt by all who are acquainted with the spell of St. John, which appears to pervade every page of the Gospel and lends it a character so unique, to accept the theory of a twofold authorship; but he maintains that only on these terms is it possible to retain the apostolicity of the Gospel as a whole; for the historical framework is such as could have been constructed by no one acquainted at first hand with the course of Christ's career.

Perhaps Wendt's discussion of the First and Third Gospels is the most valuable part of his book.

He holds that both St. Matthew and St. Luke made use of St. Mark as we now have it—the last few verses of the last chapter of course excepted—and on this framework constructed their own narratives. Neither, however, had the discernment to excerpt, as criticism is now able to do, the real course of the history; and, therefore, they also, like the editor of the Fourth Gospel, let the Baptist recognise Jesus as the Messiah; they make Jesus perform miracles from the first in great publicity; and, while retaining the scene in which the Twelve acknowledged the Messianic dignity of their Master, and other scenes in which He forbade them and others to make Him known, they do not recognise the true place and import of these incidents.

St. Matthew and St. Luke, however, display an agreement in incident and expression in the portions of their narratives not derived from St. Mark which requires explanation; and this is not to be found in the supposition that the one borrowed from the other, because St. Luke, the later of the two, is particularly shy and suspicious of St. Matthew. The explanation then must be that, besides the Gospel of St. Mark, they made use of another common source; and, going back on the old tradition of Papias, Wendt supposes this to have been the Logia of the apostle Matthew; for the author of our First Gospel is not St. Matthew, though it bears his name. Just as St. John made a collection of the sayings of the Master, his brother apostle had done the same before him; and, as St. John's editor transformed his reminiscences into a history of Christ, the authors of the First and Third Gospels did the like with the Logia of St. Matthew. Only, while the editor of St. John derived his framework from the tradition of the life of Christ current in the neighbourhood of Ephesus at the close of the first century, the other two evangelists derived theirs from St. Mark.

The first and third evangelists made their excerpts from the Logia somewhat differently. The writer of the First Gospel, following his plan of grouping miracles, parables, etc., together, attached as many of them as he could, on this principle, to the materials which he borrowed from St. Mark. St. Luke, on the contrary, interpolated them in the form of two long connected narratives into St. Mark's framework. The reproduction was further modified in each case by the point of view and purpose of the writer; and from the fact that the Logia were not written, but handed down orally, it will be understood that both evangelists exercised considerable freedom. Although, therefore there is a great deal of agreement between them, yet there are differences smaller and greater; and, by comparing them

closely, it is possible to judge with a good deal of confidence in every case which reproduction is the more exact.

Wendt undertakes the task of reproducing the Logia word for word out of St. Matthew and St. Luke; and he prints the entire document in Greek, thus giving us what even the apostolic Church did not possess. It is a bold undertaking, and, however much we may differ from him, hearty gratitude is due to him for it. He thinks he is able in many cases to make one of the evangelists correct the other; sometimes both are wrong, but, having got the exact words and restored them to their right places, we can correct them both. He makes far too little allowance, however, for modifications in the sayings of Christ which may have been due to His making the same statements or using the same illustrations on different occasions. An itinerant preacher necessarily repeats himself; but, if he has any genius, he does not do so slavishly; he gives his illustrations different applications and points the same truths in different directions; and there is no irreverence in attributing to Jesus a thing so natural. Scholars constantly forget how brief the Gospels are, and how meagre are the fragments preserved to us of what our Lord must have done and said.

Although both the First and Third Gospels are thus mainly derived from St. Mark and the Logia combined, yet both writers have added a good deal derived from other sources, to us unknown. This is especially the case at the beginning and at the end. The narratives of the birth, infancy and youth of Jesus are found in the First and Third Gospels; but Wendt does not believe that they were in the Logia, and evidently he attaches to them little importance. The same is true of many details of the death and resurrection. On the resurrection the author expresses himself with extreme caution. All the length he is prepared to go may be gathered from these words: "That the disciples had the conviction

not only that they had seen the Risen Saviour, but that by means of these appearances they had obtained distinct knowledge of His Messianic person and their own apostolic vocation, appears to me, on account of the entirely analogous belief of St. Paul, to admit of no question."

To sum up, Wendt's aim, it will be seen, is to get behind the Gospels, which are secondary or sub-apostolic formations, to the apostolic materials out of which they were constructed with additions. St. Mark is nearest to an original document; but even it contains secondary additions, and its scheme of Christ's life is confused by the lack of literary skill. Out of St. Matthew and St. Luke another apostolic document can be reconstructed; but to the apostolic materials less trustworthy information has been added, and already the actual development of Christ's life has been forgotten. In St. John also we have an apostolic document of unique value, but it is hidden in another document, which breathes an entirely different spirit and has no sense whatever for the historicity of Christ's career. Among the secondary additions Wendt would reckon a great many of the outstanding miracles attributed to Christ—such as the Changing of Water into Wine, the Stilling of the Storm, St. Peter's Walking on the Sea, the Resurrection of the Daughter of Jairus, of the Widow's Son at Nain and of Lazarus, and, I suppose, also the bodily Resurrection of Christ Himself.

In the German preface to the second volume of his work Dr. Wendt complains of the slight attention bestowed on his first volume; but this misfortune has probably been a blessing in disguise; because, had the contents of the critical volume been well known in this country, the fact would probably have modified the welcome with which the translated volume has been received.

There are those, indeed, to whom such a presentation of the life of Christ may be a godsend. If a man has lost faith in the credibility of the Gospels and thus had his belief in the Son of God shattered altogether, the notion may be a highly welcome one that it is possible to get behind the actual Gospels and find a story, exiguous indeed and lacking in colour, yet apostolic and true; for this may seem to give him Jesus back again and to relight the lamp of religion. Accordingly, this critical procedure is lauded in certain quarters as being not the destruction but the restoration of belief. The meaning, however, of such a claim requires strict definition. To anyone who has a full-bodied faith in Christ and confidence in the Gospels such a scheme of the life of Christ as is supplied by Wendt is pure loss. To the common man it is disastrous in the highest degree, because it means that, when the Gospels are opened and the most affecting words of Christ read, there cannot be the slightest certainty whether or not these sayings actually emanated from Him or were secondary formations due to minds which only partially comprehended His spirit; this cannot be decided before the termination of a critical process, in which no two of the learned entirely agree. The question is not one of whether or not perfect accuracy is to be found in every detail of an incident, or whether the precise force of every saying of our Lord has been comprehended by the reporter: it is whether the greatest of the miracles attributed to Him were actually performed, and whether a considerable proportion of the words put into His mouth never came from His lips at all.

It may be that there lies before us a period in which the whole question will be thrashed out among ourselves on the lines on which it has been discussed in Germany. The impression, indeed, prevails in this country even among the educated that, the Tübingen theory being exploded, the

credibility of the Gospels has been settled forever. This, however, is an over-sanguine view, and does not at all correspond with the state of opinion abroad. Wendt, on the contrary, is a moderate representative of a large and extremely able set of German critics. The growing familiarity of the public mind in this country with the theories of Old Testament criticism may pave the way for a similar treatment of the Gospels; and the theories, backed by great accumulations of learning, are ready to the hand of anyone who may wish to distinguish himself by giving a shock to orthodoxy. The process, once begun, would not be easily brought to a termination; for there is no end to the combinations which are possible, when once it is taken for granted that the representations of the Gospels are not the actual facts, but creations of the imagination which have grown out of them.

Still there are aspects of Wendt's performance which are reassuring, even in view of such contingencies. Although to our insular notions his position appears extreme, he would be reckoned in the circle to which he belongs in a high degree conservative. He stands as the last term of a gigantic course of investigation, and, when his results are compared with the wilder ideas of the Tübingen school, the contrast is great. Even as they stand, the Gospels all belong, according to this author, to the first century, and in every one of them there is a large kernel proceeding directly from the apostolic circle. Wendt's detailed comparison, in his translated volume, of the teaching of Christ as reported by St. John with the same teaching as reported by the Synoptists, in order to prove their identity, is one of the most striking things in recent theology. The attempt to bring the Gospels far down and away from immediate connection with Christ has apparently failed. To use an illustration of Principal Rainy, the Gospel narrative, like a living creature, after being forcibly stretched away down

into the second century, has drawn itself together again right back into the heart of the first century. The question is thus very much narrowed. Was it possible in so short a time, within the memory of men who had lived with Christ, for the history to be so transformed? Could the course of Christ's career be so speedily forgotten? Could so many wonders, adorned with minute and lifelike details, be attributed to Him which He never performed?

It cannot be denied that there are some great difficulties in the Gospels, and we are indebted to Wendt for showing so clearly what these are. One thing, however, which makes one distrust his mode of approaching them is the stupidity which he is constantly attributing to the evangelists. They have misunderstood Christ, according to him, where His drift is perfectly obvious; they have overlooked the connection of this and that, when it might have been seen with half an eye. This reaches a height in the case of the fourth evangelist, who simply peppers the noble narrative of St. John with wrong-headed remarks and disquisitions. Leaving the reverence aside which may be due to holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, I am always suspicious of any theory which makes the writers of Scripture talk downright nonsense.

The truth is, Wendt's work is dominated from first to last by a theory. He makes no secret of it: on the contrary, he states it in the very first pages of the volume which I am reviewing, and he makes it the standard for judging every statement in the Gospels. This theory is, that the life of our Lord pursued the course, already described, which he finds indicated in St. Mark—although even St. Mark is not true to it, St. Matthew and St. Luke are unaware of it, and the Fourth Gospel clean contradicts it.

The outline of the life of Christ, which Wendt thus makes the standard for testing the evangelists, contains,

indeed, a great deal to which no objection need be taken ; but the denial that the Baptist acknowledged Jesus as the Messiah has very little to rest on. St. Mark, indeed, says that at His baptism Jesus saw the heavens rent asunder and the Spirit descending ; but he says not a word to indicate that He alone saw this vision and heard the voice which acknowledged Him as the Son of God. The whole scene has the appearance of being intended for others rather than for Him—the consciousness of Jesus did not require such external demonstrations to assist its operations.

But, asks Wendt, if the Baptist thus acknowledged the Messiahship of Jesus, and if other testimonies to it arose here and there from the first, what importance was there in the great confession of the Twelve through the lips of St. Peter? This seems a formidable difficulty ; but, when this question is asked, are we not overlooking the religious character of the confession of the Twelve? Their confession was not a dry inference from the observation of facts ; it was an outburst of religious conviction, and a solemn vow by which they were prepared to stand. And truth, when it is realised and acknowledged in this way, has all the force of novelty, although it may have been heard long before by the hearing of the ear.

I have never been able to feel any force in the assertion, which Wendt repeats, that, if at the baptism John had acknowledged the Messiahship of Jesus, he could not afterwards have sent his message from the prison. The most elementary acquaintance with the psychology of religion ought to enable us to understand how a man who was in the Baptist's circumstances and had passed through all that he had undergone might come to doubt what he had once firmly believed.

Christ's practice of requesting those whom He healed not to make Him known, and of enjoining His apostles not to reveal His Messiahship, is a perplexing trait ; but I

am not satisfied that Wendt's explanation is the correct one. St. Matthew quotes in explanation of it an ancient prophecy to the effect that the Messiah would not strive or cry or cause His voice to be heard in the streets; and this may be the true explanation—that it was due not to policy and deliberation, but to a subtle and delicate peculiarity of the temperament of Jesus. When it is recorded that Jesus enjoined one whom He had cured to tell no man, but that, in the ecstasy of restored health, the man blazed abroad the matter, are we quite certain that Jesus was displeased? We now read the statement with an amused gratification, and I am by no means certain that this was not the effect on Jesus likewise.

If Jesus had kept Himself as obscure as Wendt represents Him to have done and held back so long any hint of His Messiahship, it is a question how far the public and the authorities would have been responsible for at last refusing to acknowledge His claim.

But the final question is whether this figure presented by Wendt, and presented confidently by an increasing school in Germany, can be the veritable picture of Christ—the figure of One who had no pre-existence, but was the son of Joseph and Mary; who knew some secrets of the medical art and by means of these healed the sick, but did not raise Jairus' daughter, or the widow's son, or the brother of the sisters of Bethany; who taught the words of eternal life, but was not Himself rescued from the power of the grave? Is this the authentic portrait of Jesus Christ? It is totally unlike the image presented by the Gospel of St. Mark as a whole. But, even if St. Mark did offer it—or any skilfully excerpted section of St. Mark—would it be credible? In my opinion it would be utterly incredible. We do not know for certain the dates of the Gospels; but we do know, almost to a year, the dates of the great, universally recognised epistles of St. Paul. This apostle was of almost the

same age as Jesus, and he was at the full height of his powers when he applied his mind to the scrutiny of the life of Christ. Now, what is the image of Christ presented in St. Paul's writings? Christ is the Judge of men, and, therefore, He must have a supernatural knowledge of their hearts; He is the Saviour of the world, on whom the burdened conscience can lay the whole weight of its sin and the immortal spirit the whole weight of its destiny; He was before all things, and He now lives as the ascended Lord at the right hand of God; His name is above every name, and to Him every knee shall bow. This was not the faith of St. Paul alone: it was notoriously the faith of the whole Church within a single generation of Christ's death; for on this subject there was no difference of opinion among the first witnesses of Christianity. Now, is there any resemblance between this image and that which Wendt proposes to put in its place? It is true that, with the great exception of the resurrection, St. Paul does not mention the miracles of our Lord; but the entire image of the Saviour presented in the Pauline writings—and the same is true of all the writings of the New Testament—is congruent and harmonious with a birth, a life and a death such as the actual Gospels depict, and it is utterly incongruous with such a history as Wendt puts together from the gospel within the Gospels. If Christianity from the very start was founded on a huge falsification, to however innocent causes the distortion of facts may have been due, it is vain at this time of day to attempt to begin it over again. Besides, if Christ was not the glorious Son of God whom the evangelists and apostles represented Him to be, but only this figure to which those who agree with Wendt would reduce Him, then it is far more evident that it is hopeless to reintegrate the Christian religion upon these terms; for this is not the kind of Saviour that the world requires.

JAMES STALKER.

JESUS MIRRORED IN MATTHEW, MARK,
AND LUKE.

VI. JESUS LONGING FOR TRUE DISCIPLES.

IT has been customary to call the remarkable utterance preserved in Matthew xi. 28-30 *The Gracious Invitation*. It has been gradually dawning on my mind that, without prejudice to the truth underlying that title, the saying might with even greater appropriateness be described as the *pium desiderium* of the Great Master for apt scholars. Its setting in the Gospel narrative suggests this view. It forms the suitable close of a chapter whose burden is *disillusionment*. Jesus appears in this chapter as a disappointed, though not discouraged or utterly forlorn, Teacher. Nowhere has He found the reception He might reasonably have looked for. The Galileans in whose synagogues He has preached, the people whom He has taught and healed wherever they gathered in crowds, the religious guides of Israel, even John the Baptist—one and all have failed to satisfy His desire for sincere, intelligent, sympathetic discipleship. He finds consolation in the honest attachment of some humble persons whom He calls “babes.” Yet “babes,” while a comfort, can hardly give complete contentment. Something higher is easily conceivable—a class of disciples who are babes and *more*, combining the simplicity of children with the understanding and experience of men. That were the ideal; it is for that Jesus here sighs.

If this sigh of the Lord Jesus be placed in its proper historical environment, its date is approximately fixed by the various allusions to contemporary opinions contained in the eleventh chapter of Matthew. That the synagogue ministry is past, is shown by the complaint against the

three cities.¹ The later mission to the publicans lies far enough behind to give time for the coining of slanderous epithets and sneering nicknames.² The fame of Jesus as a popular Preacher and Healer has spread far and wide till it has even reached the ears of the illustrious prisoner in Machaerus, provoking that doubting message, Art thou the Coming One? The hostility of the scribes has had ample space to develop itself, so as to make it manifest that nothing but contempt or bitter opposition is to be looked for from the "wise and prudent."³

The situation thus defined suits such an utterance as that contained in Matthew xi. 25-30. The word and the environment fit into each other so well as to leave little doubt that the Evangelist has given that word its true position in his story, and as little that we may legitimately interpret it in the light of its context. In that case its general character is at once fixed. It is the utterance of One who is profoundly conscious of isolation, and who is driven in upon Himself and upon God; yet is full of peace and hope because He is assured that His Father knows and approves Him, and will not leave Him forlorn. Herein the soul of Jesus goes first up to God in resignation and trust,⁴ then out in eager longing towards an ideal discipleship not actually there, perhaps not to be found then anywhere within the bounds of Palestine, but existing for the prophetic eye in the womb of the future, and to be born in due season.⁵

Surprise has often been expressed that Luke should have failed to preserve this precious oracle, giving only the outpouring of Christ's spirit towards God, and omitting what seems to suit his pages so well, the outgoing of His loving heart towards the labouring and heavy-laden. Of this hereafter. Meantime I remark that what is most to be

¹ vv. 20-24.² v. 19.³ v. 25.⁴ vv. 25-27.⁵ vv. 28-30.

wondered at is that any part of the utterance has been preserved ; for it is really a soliloquy, a devotional meditation of our Lord by Himself apart, not a prayer spoken in the hearing of disciples. Even the part which concerns men, the sigh for true disciples, was not meant for human ears : it was simply a private breathing in which the weary heart of the Master unburdened itself. How then did it become known to any ? True reverence perhaps would be best shown by abstaining from conjecture, but a simple suggestion may be pardoned. A ray of light seems to come to us from the fact that, on the testimony of Papias, the original reporter of our Lord's words was the Apostle *Matthew*, a publican, and in virtue of that occupation also a *scribe*. We have already seen that in calling a publican Jesus had an eye to service in connection with His mission to the class to which Matthew belonged. May He not also have had in view service with the pen by the same disciple, acting as a kind of secretary ? How was it possible for Matthew, years after the Master left the world, to compile that book of *Logia*, i.e., Oracles of the Lord ? Did he draw simply on a retentive memory ? Is it not more likely that he had at command *memoranda* written in bygone disciple days ? Would not the instinct or habit that led him to write the *Logia* lead him to take notes at the time ? and may the desire that this should be done not have been one of the reasons of his call ? But, granting the reasonableness of this suggestion with reference to such sayings as those which constitute the Sermon on the Mount, it may be asked, What has all this to do with a soliloquy of Jesus such as that under consideration ? How should even a private secretary know that his Master had thought or spoken so ? Who can tell ? Would it surprise you if the one disciple who had access to the Master at such a solemn hour was just the *publican* ; the last first, the despised one privileged to be the confidant of the still more Despised

One, despised too very specially on account of the relations He had chosen to enter into with the class to which that disciple belonged? When Jesus uttered this prayer, He passed through a kind of minor agony. At the hour of the greater agony He desired to have three disciples near Him. What wonder if He chose *one* to be with Him at the earlier crisis, and just the one most fitted by his own previous experience to understand the Master's mood?

Not doubting that in the closing part of a precious leaf from the private prayer-book of Jesus, though preserved in the first Gospel alone, we have a true word of the Lord, let us try still further to penetrate into its inmost meaning.

In the utterance beginning with "I thank Thee, O Father," and ending with "My yoke is easy and my burden is light," there is a mixture of conflicting feelings—of satisfaction and longing, of thankfulness for babe-disciples, and intense desire for disciples who are "babes" and something more. The babes include the Twelve, though not them alone. Therefore Christ's feeling even about them is of a mixed character. He is pleased to have these simple Galileans about Him, and yet they do not fill His heart. He is conscious of isolation in their company. They love Him, but they do not understand Him. He has many thoughts in His mind, which He must speak if He is to fulfil His mission, and make known to the world the vision of the kingdom which lies before His spiritual eye. But to whom are they to be spoken? To these babes? Yes, if no better audience can be had. They possess one fundamental requirement of discipleship—moral sympathy with the Teacher. They are ready to hear what He has to say, and implicitly trust in His wisdom. To such hearers it is not idle to speak; revelation of the things of the Kingdom to the like of them, to some extent at least, is possible. But "these things" can be shown to such only in part.

They cannot understand them fully now, perhaps never. The natural limitation of their thinking powers, still more the limitations of their experience in the past or in the future, may present an insurmountable barrier to complete comprehension of the ideas of their Master. It is possible that there is not one among them who has it in him to attain full insight into the Christianity of Christ, or to become so completely possessed by the Master's mind as to be fit for the rôle of a thoroughly competent enthusiastic interpreter. It may be assumed as certain that not all, or even the majority, of them possess any such capacity. But to the presence or absence in his disciple-circle of persons endowed with such capabilities no great teacher or religious initiator can be indifferent. He will make the powers of his scholars a subject of frequent study. He will often consider what they severally are good for, what part this one or that one is fitted to play. And if among them all, after due consideration, he find no one able to receive or effectively reproduce his scheme of thought, whatever pleasure he may have in their society, he will certainly not be free from a haunting sense of loneliness and sadness.

It is in some such mood and for such reasons, it appears to me, that Jesus here speaks. With longing heart He looks over the heads of the actual disciple-circle, with wistful eye, in quest of an ideal discipleship.

But how is the ideal to be defined? What are the marks of the perfectly apt disciple? Jesus, we observe, addresses Himself to the "labouring and heavy laden." Is that the kind of description we should look for, assuming that an ideal discipleship is in view? To answer the question, one must have some sort of *a priori* conception of the ideal. How then are we to conceive it? Somewhat after this manner:

1. The ideal disciple will, of course, possess in a high

degree the disciple-*spirit*: desiring wisdom above all things, with a single mind and a pure heart.

2. He will feel profoundly that he has not yet attained. No one comes to the school of the wise who is self-satisfied—who thinks he knows all and can himself teach others.

The first of these qualities differentiates the disciple from the ordinary frequenter of synagogues, or the average hearer in a street crowd. The second differentiates the disciple from the "wise and prudent." Both qualities were possessed by the Twelve, and therein their Master had cause for satisfaction. But there is a third quality, which they probably all lacked.

3. The ideal disciple is one who has been prepared for receiving the instruction of a new master by disappointing trial of other masters. He has toiled in the quest of wisdom and has failed. He comes to the new school a weary man, longing for the rest which the revelation of truth satisfying to the whole inner being brings. He comes thoroughly qualified to appreciate the lessons he is to be taught by knowledge of other doctrines with which he can compare them. For men living in Palestine in the time of our Lord this would mean acquaintance with the teaching of the Rabbis, and the discovery by earnest experiment of its unsatisfactory character. It would mean, in other words, an experience similar to that of Saul of Tarsus, who was first an enthusiastic disciple of, and then a convert from, Rabbinism. His soul-history in those years was a very tragic business—a sore toil of the spirit ending in vexation and heaviness of heart. What if he had met Jesus while He was on earth, become one of His disciples and heard His golden words, and seen His gracious deeds from day to day, instead of being "one born out of due time"?¹ It might have made some difference in his conception of the

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 8.

Christian religion, and in the colour of his writings. But be this as it may, what I wish to say now is that it was for such disciples as he that Jesus craved; for men who were not merely simple, sincere, and honest-hearted, but in possession of spiritual senses exercised to discern between good and evil; that is to say, not only between the obviously good and evil, but between the real and the reputedly good, and the real and the reputedly evil. To that the Twelve had not attained. Possibly there was not a single man living in Palestine at that time that had attained. The man who came inquiring concerning eternal life was on the way to the attainment: hence the interest he created in the mind of Jesus, who saw in him a possible Paul or Barnabas, and may, for ought we know, have thought of him as a substitute for a false disciple already suspected of treason. But he had the fatal defect of insufficient earnestness. He knew more than he was prepared to put in practice.

Is the ideal disciple, as just described, properly designated by the epithets "labouring and heavy laden"? Yes, if we take the words, as they surely ought to be taken, in a spiritual sense. There is no toil so arduous as the quest of the *summum bonum* when carried on in the spirit of a Paul or a Buddha, and no burden so heavy as that of the heart which has long sought and not yet found. Those who have passed through the experience know the truth of this statement, though to others it may seem a great exaggeration. Christ comprehended the labour and the burden, and pitied the sufferer, and yearned to give him relief. Let us not be deceived by the simple terms in which He addresses him into the prosaic idea that it is purely physical toil and weariness He has in view, and that in a spirit of disgusted reaction He turns from the disdainful scribe to the illiterate peasant for satisfying discipleship. Bodily labour and fatigue simply serve the purpose of an emblem. The toil present to His mind is

not that which has for its object the meat that perisheth, but that which has for its aim the meat that endureth unto everlasting life. So understood, the words of Jesus necessarily point to the highest type of religious experience: that which is heroic in effort and temper and tragic in career. Nothing short of that deserves to be so characterized. Feeble desire for the eternal is not labour, and failure to obtain the object of such desire is no burden.

When we know who are meant by the "labouring and heavy laden" we understand why Jesus describes Himself as "meek and lowly in heart." Till we perceive who are addressed, we fail to discern any fitness in the allusion. Might not the Teacher with equal appropriateness have specified some other characteristics? Probably many a student of the Gospels, while drawn to this oracle by its inexpressible charm, has had such a feeling, while hardly willing to avow it to himself. The feeling disappears when we have defined the ideal disciple. The underlying thought is then seen to be that the moods of Master and scholar correspond. The weary seeker after wisdom, or the knowledge of the Highest Good, is meek and lowly. He is as one whose heart has been broken and his spirit bruised. His heart is not haughty, nor his eyes lofty. His soul is even as a weaned child. He needs one who can speak tenderly as well as wisely, fully acquainted with his case, and sympathetic in his attitude towards both his aspirations and his disappointments. As such an one Jesus offers Himself. To the labouring and heavy laden He in effect says: "The Lord God hath given Me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary." And how has He acquired this supreme talent? By an experience of disappointment answering to that of those whom He invites to His school. They have been disappointed in their teachers, He has been disappointed in His scholars. In synagogue and street crowd,

among the disciples of the Rabbis, and even in His own disciple-circle, His experience has been disenchanting: limited receptivity at the best, not infrequently a total lack of receptivity. So the ideal disciple and He need one another, and suit one another. He needs them to fill His teacher's heart, they need Him to satisfy the hunger of their souls. And there is mutual sympathy as well as mutual need. Similarity in experience has produced congeniality of temper.

When such a Teacher and such scholars meet, one can predict what will happen. They will find solace in each other's company; of that also Jesus speaks, though only on one side of the joint experience. Of the solace the disciple will bring to Him, He makes no mention; but to the solace He will communicate He does refer in these words: "And ye shall find rest to your souls." There will be at least the rest that comes from the sense of being perfectly understood and fully sympathised with. But that is not all that is needed. There must be instruction as well as sympathy. The Teacher must be able to give what the scholar has hitherto sought in vain: a word of eternal life that shall bring contentment to the whole inner being—mind, heart, conscience. Jesus recognises this when He speaks of His "yoke." The taking of the yoke means coming to His school, and the invitation to come is an acknowledgment of obligation on His part to perform the Teacher's rôle. He must teach, and teach satisfactorily, so that the pupil shall not need to leave Him, as he has left others, and go in quest of a new teacher. And accordingly He promises satisfaction by characterising His yoke as "easy." A teacher's yoke is easy when his doctrine commends itself to reason and conscience. An easy yoke does not necessarily imply a low, accommodating ideal of life. On the contrary, the teacher's ideal may be lofty, exacting, apparently unattainable, yet the reverse of burdensome be-

cause sweetly reasonable and true to the deepest instincts of the soul. Such was the moral ideal of Jesus as set forth in His recorded words : high and difficult, yet not grievous ; awakening enthusiasm, therefore no burden to the spirit. What a contrast to the yoke of the Rabbis !

In the light of the foregoing interpretation of Christ's statement concerning Himself, we can see clearly how feeble is the argument which has been based upon it against the authenticity of the Logion "Come unto Me." Christ, it is argued, could not have said "I am meek and lowly" just because He was meek and lowly. Self-eulogy, even in soliloquy, is incompatible with humility.¹ Various things might be said in reply to this ethical canon of criticism. But the simplest way to dispose of it is to point out that what we have in the words objected to is, properly speaking, not self-eulogy but self-description. They describe a *mood* rather than lay claim to a *virtue*. If it was not egotism in the prophet to represent himself as one whom God had trained to speak a word in season to him that was weary, as little was it egotism in Jesus to use a form of words which in effect means the same thing. If a Psalmist in the Divine Presence might say, "My heart is not haughty," why might not Jesus say "I am meek and lowly" without prejudice to His humility? Prophet, Psalmist, and Jesus all speak out of the same mood, not in a spirit of boasting, rather in a tone of self-humiliation. Their utterances are the devout breathings of a broken and contrite heart too familiar with the vanity of life while still able to hope in God.

The view here presented as to the import of the Logion "Come unto Me," and the mood which it expresses, help us moreover to understand its omission by Luke, assuming that he was not unacquainted with it, but knew perfectly

¹ So in substance Martineau. *Vide my Apologetics*, p. 4.

well that it formed a part of a larger whole, the former portion of which he has preserved. We have seen that it is the way of this Evangelist to exercise editorial discretion in reference to whatever affects the character of the Lord Jesus or of His apostles, omitting, pruning, strongly stating, as the case might require. This idiosyncrasy comes into play here, giving rise to modification of what has been retained, and to the omission of what could not be modified. The modification consists in the altered mood out of which the utterance is made to spring. In Luke's account Jesus speaks at a moment of exulting gladness, occasioned by the glowing reports of the Seventy just returned from their evangelistic mission. The historical setting there assigned to the devotional outpouring is intrinsically improbable as compared to that given to it in Matthew, and the exultant mood ascribed to Jesus is hardly what we should have expected from Him even in such a connection as Luke's narrative postulates. That the great Master had already found His own ministry disappointing is beyond doubt. Is it likely that the results of the minor efforts of the Twelve or of the Seventy, however gratifying so far as they went, would move him to ecstatic joy, and to passionate outpouring of His soul in devout thanksgiving? The situation and the mood, as conceived by Luke, are wholly inadequate to the quality of the utterance. It is another instance illustrating his inability to do justice to the tragic element in our Lord's character and experience.

The omission of the second part is due in some measure to the same inability. Luke apparently did not know what to make of it. He felt instinctively that it did not fit in to the supposed situation and mood. Two things would give him this feeling: the unmistakable tone of sadness pervading the words, and the description of the persons addressed as labouring and heavy laden. "I am meek and lowly in heart." Luke understood better than some modern critics

that these words were the description of a mood, not a piece of self-eulogy; and taking them so, he perceived their unsuitableness to a moment of triumphant gladness. That was one reason for omission. Another was the inapplicability of the epithets "labouring and heavy laden" to the case of the Seventy or the Twelve. There need, indeed, have been no difficulty on that score if the words, as Resch supposes,¹ referred to the fatigue connected with the recent mission, and, as employed by Jesus, meant: Come, ye tired and weary Evangelists, and I will give you a recreative holiday. But I do not think it possible that an idea so utterly prosaic could ever have entered Luke's head. He knew enough of Christ's intellectual habitudes to be aware that the labour and the burden must be symbols of spiritual experiences. And just there lay his perplexity. He could not imagine the members of the disciple-circle as the subjects of any such experiences. Were they not rather happy men in possession of enviable privileges and powers? Why should they be asked to come to Christ's school? Had they not been there for some time already, and had they not made some progress in the lore which brought light and peace and contentment to the spirit? There was nothing for it but to omit the words so long as they were supposed to refer to the disciple-circle. They might have been preserved as words spoken to other persons, as expressing a desire for a discipleship of a more radical and satisfying character. But that course was not open to Luke, who was ever anxious to spare the Twelve. So viewed, the "Come unto Me" would indicate dissatisfaction with all actual disciples; therefore, even with them. Words bearing such a meaning Luke would certainly not report.

Yet one other argument against the authenticity of this famous saying remains to be disposed of; that, viz., based

¹ In his recent work on *The Extra-canonical Parallels to Matthew and Mark*, p. 132.

on an alleged literary resemblance between it and *the Prayer of Jesus the Son of Sirach*, in the last chapter of the Old Testament Apocryphal book which bears the name of the *Wisdom of Sirach*. That a certain resemblance does exist, I am not disposed to deny. There is just enough to have led me years ago, in reading the book, to note in the margin a reference to Matthew xi. 28-30. It will be best to reproduce the passage in which the likeness appears, so that readers may judge for themselves. In the version of the Apocrypha, recently published by the Revisers of the Authorised Version of the Old and New Testaments, it stands thus :

Chap. li. 23. *Draw near unto me, ye unlearned, and lodge in the house of instruction.*

24. Say wherefore are ye lacking in these things, and your souls are very thirsty.

25. I opened my mouth and spake : get her for yourselves without money.

26. *Put your neck under the yoke and let your soul receive instruction ; she is hard at hand to find.*

27. Behold with your eyes how that I laboured but a little and found for myself *much rest.*

28. Get you instruction with a great sum of silver and gain much gold by her.

29. May your soul rejoice in His mercy, and may ye not be put to shame in praising Him.

30. Work your work before the time cometh, and in His time He will give you your reward.

The resemblance is in the passages I have marked in italics, and it is real so far as it goes. Far from wishing to

deny this, I am rather tempted to exaggerate the extent of the likeness, because if it were certain that the author of the words in the Gospel, whoever he was, had the Prayer of the Son of Sirach in his view, an argument might thence be drawn for the unity of the whole passage (Matt. xi. 25-30). For Sirach's prayer, like this evangelic section, begins with a prayer and ends with an invitation, and the first word of both prayers is the same.¹ If the utterance of the later Jesus be a composition based on the devout outpouring of the earlier, then Matthew has preserved the whole of it and Luke has given only a fragment. It is worth noting a literary affinity which has any chance of yielding so satisfactory a result. But it may be feared that what we gain in one direction we lose in another. In other words, the question readily suggests itself, Does the literary affinity, once recognised, not compel the admission that Matthew xi. 25-30 is not a genuine utterance of our Lord, but a composition by the Evangelist, or by some one from whom he has borrowed? Without hesitation I say, by no means. Why should not the resemblance in question be the result of an acquaintance on the part of Jesus Himself with the *Wisdom of Sirach*, an acquaintance dating possibly from boyhood, and leaving its traces in phrases which perhaps unconsciously colour the style of His address to ideal disciples? How far, as a matter of fact, acquaintance with an Apocryphal book such as Sirach was likely to be possessed by non-professional Galileans in the time of Christ, I do not know. But on the hypothesis we are considering some one belonging to the early Christian Church knew the book; and if that was possible for him, why not also for Jesus? And if the book was within His reach, I do not think he would have any scruple about perusing it. He might read it as a good book though not canonical; and

¹ "I will give thanks to Thee," in Sirach; "I thank Thee," in the Gospel.

though abstaining in the time of His public ministry from citing it as authoritative Scripture, He might not think it necessary to be anxiously on His guard against allowing its phrases to find an occasional faint echo in His own style.

All this is merely hypothetical reasoning. Whether the resemblance between the two devotional utterances be more than an accident, I am not prepared confidently to determine. It is so slight that it might quite well be an utterly undesigned coincidence. It concerns the expression chiefly, hardly at all the thought, in respect of which the utterance of the Lord is incomparably superior. Even in the matter of style the words of the earlier Jesus are poor by comparison. How artificial and stilted its diction compared with the simplicity, felicity and spontaneity of the "Come unto Me"! This has taken its place among the golden words of the religious literature of mankind. The "Draw near unto me" of Sirach has nothing in it to insure even temporary fame, not to speak of immortality. It is redolent of the lamp rather than of Divine inspiration. I owe an apology to devout Christian people for placing the two prayers side by side even for a moment. My excuse must be that modern critics have compelled me.

The unity of Matthew xi. 25-30 justifies an important inference as to the central truth the great Master is to communicate to His ideal disciples. It is that God is a Father. In the first part of the devotional soliloquy He has spoken of that truth as a secret which it is His exclusive prerogative to reveal. It must be supposed to be present to His mind when He proceeds to invite the labouring and heavy laden. That truth He will be pleased to reveal to them. The revelation He expects to give them deep satisfaction. As the Revealer of that truth, they will recognise in Him a Teacher standing in sharp contrast to their other masters, and One whose yoke is easy because the truth He teaches sets free from everything in religion that

imposes fetters on the spirit. Nothing but a true doctrine of God can meet the requirements of the case. The vital thing in religion and in life is how we conceive God. On the idea we cherish of the Divine Being it depends whether our religion is to be a bane or a blessing, emancipating or enslaving, in moral tendency elevating or degrading. Come then to Christ's school, all ye who desire the true knowledge of God. Learn of Him how to think of God, man and their relations. His doctrine solves all vital problems: the problems of past sin, of present duty, and of future destiny.

A. B. BRUCE.

ABRAHAM.

“The Lord said to Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father’s house, unto the land that I will show thee: And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: And I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed. So Abram went, as the Lord had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him: and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran.”—GENESIS xii. 1-4.

PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER, in a well-known Essay on Semitic Monotheism published many years ago, has a remarkable passage on the great place which belongs to Abraham in the history, not of the Jews alone, but of the human race. He says that faith in the one living God, wherever it exists—that is, as a real religious force, not merely as a philosophical speculation—“may be traced back to one man,—to him in whom ‘all the families of the earth shall be blessed.’” “We see in him,” he continues, “the life-spring of that faith which was to unite all the nations of the earth. We want to know more of that man than we do; but even with the little we know of him he stands before us as a figure second only to one in the whole history of the world” (*Chips from a German Workshop*, vol. i. pp. 373-4).

That is a remarkable estimate; I am not sure that it is an exaggeration. The Lord Jesus Christ stands apart and alone—in a supremacy which removes Him from all comparison with even the greatest of mankind. But there is no other that can be placed by the side of Abraham, if we estimate his greatness by the immense and beneficial effect of his life and character on the condition of mankind.

How is it that some races have worshipped one God, while others—not inferior to them in all that constitutes the splendour of secular civilisation; their superiors, indeed, in many of the most brilliant forms of genius—have

worshipped many gods? How is it that the nations of Europe and America, the Jews, and a large part of the populations of Africa and Western Asia, and part of India, are monotheistic, while the rest of India and China are heathen?

M. Comte maintained that when science discovered that the whole of the physical universe illustrates the power of the same laws, that the same great physical forces are active in every country, on the land and the sea, in the world, and—as far as we can discover—in all other worlds, it was impossible for Polytheism to survive. There was no longer any place for the separate Divine powers which, according to the older faith, had divided the sovereignty of the universe between them. The unity of the physical universe carried with it the unity of God. It is obvious to reply that in ancient times the Jews, who were the least speculative and scientific of all nations, were the worshippers of one God, and that the Egyptians and the Greeks, who had the most brilliant scientific genius, worshipped many gods. It is true that those modern nations which have been greatest in physical science have also been monotheistic; but Western Europe, and the Saracens who for a time settled in Spain, were first believers in one God—and *then* achieved their scientific discoveries. It would be far more reasonable and historical to say that monotheism led the way to a scientific belief in the unity of the universe, than to say that a scientific belief in the unity of the universe led the way to monotheism. No. Monotheism comes from Abraham. There lies his greatness. Trace the belief in one God, wherever you find it, to its original spring, and you come to him. In him it has its historic roots.

There are three great monotheistic faiths: Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism. Outside these three religions men worship many gods. Judaism is the direct outgrowth of Abraham's faith. Christianity came from

Judaism; and Mohammedanism is compounded partly of Judaism, partly of Christianity.

I remember a pathetic and impressive illustration of the kinship of these three great religions. The stern and desolate granite rocks of Sinai surrounded by the waste and desolation of the desert are the eternal memorial of Judaism; but on the very summit of the mountain, within a few yards of each other, there are a small Christian chapel and a small Mohammedan mosque. The whole history of Monotheism is represented there. At Sinai Judaism does not need as its monument any work of human hands: the bare rocks, which look as if the power of God had passed over them, destroying nearly every trace of life,—these are enough to stand for the grandeur and endurance of the ancient faith. The chapel and the mosque are the homage which Christianity and Mohammedanism offer to the faith of Abraham and his descendants.

But of late years we have heard a great deal of the mysterious differences between different races of mankind; and the characteristic powers of different races are declared to be to a large extent the explanation of their history. Are we quite right in speaking of Monotheism as though under God it came to us through one man—through Abraham? Did it not come through the Semitic race? Was not this their distinctive service to mankind? A great French scholar—a man of wide learning, of great ingenuity, and with a literary genius which I suppose has not been equalled in Europe since the death of Voltaire—M. Renan, was of this opinion. In one of his most famous works he contended that Monotheism was an instinct of the Semitic races—an instinct not shared by the rest of mankind who belong to the Aryan race. That was a brilliant fancy: but, like so many other of his theories, it was a fancy only; it was directly contradicted by the most certain and notorious facts.

It was mainly to criticise and to destroy this theory, which was set out with great eloquence and beauty in M. Renan's *General History and Systematic Comparison of the Semitic Languages*, that Mr. Max Müller wrote the article which I have already quoted. He shows that the Semitic nations of Syria, Phœnicia, Mesopotamia, and Yemen, were polytheistic like the rest of mankind; that the Arabians before Mohammed were polytheistic; that the Semitic tribes which surrounded the Jews were polytheistic: they worshipped Dagon and Ashtaroth and Baal, and other gods besides. And even the Jews themselves were incessantly drifting into idolatry. Mr. Max Müller asks,—“Could the monotheistic instinct of the Semitic race, if it was an instinct, have been so frequently obscured, or the polytheistic instinct of the Aryan race so completely annihilated, as to allow the Jews to worship in all the high places round Jerusalem, and the Greeks and Romans to become believers in Christ?”

No; the Old Testament account is the true one. God in some wonderful way revealed Himself to Abraham. This, as Mr. Max Müller contended, is the only reasonable account of the matter.

It is apparent from several indications in the early Jewish books that Abraham belonged to a race, not of Monotheists, but of men who worshipped false gods. When Jacob left his uncle Laban in Padan Aram, Laban complained that he had taken away his *gods* (Gen. xxxi. 30). And when Jacob had returned to Palestine and was coming near to Bethel, Jacob said to his household and to all that were with him, “Put away *the strange gods* that are among you . . . and let us arise and go up to Bethel, and I will make there an altar unto God” (Gen. xxxv. 2, 3). And when the Jewish nations entered the Promised Land to take possession of it, Joshua is represented as saying, “Your fathers dwelt of old time beyond the River, even

Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nahor : and they served *other gods*. . . . If it seem evil unto you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom ye will serve ; whether the gods which your fathers served that were beyond the River, or the gods of the Amorites, in whose land ye dwell : but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord " (Josh. xxiv. 2, 15).

How the revelation of God came to Abraham we do not know, but there is a charming legend known perhaps to most of us, but which I will venture to repeat for the sake of those who have never heard it.

The scene, according to Dean Stanley, is laid sometimes in Ur, sometimes in the celebrated hill above Damascus. He gives the story in the form in which it is preserved in the Koran. " When night overshadowed him, Abraham saw a star and said, ' This is my Lord.' But when the star set, he said, ' I like not those that set.' And when he saw the moon rising, he said, ' This is my Lord.' But when the moon set, he answered, ' Verily if my Lord direct me not in the right way, I shall be as one of those who err.' And when he saw the sun rising, he said, ' This is my Lord. This is greater than the star or moon.' But when the sun went down, he said, ' O my people, I am clear of these things. I turn my face to Him who hath made the heaven and the earth.' "

The legend becomes more impressive when we remember that on the great plains of Central Asia, from the earliest times, the heavenly hosts received worship. But however the knowledge of the one true living God came to him, it was not a doubtful inference of his own from what he saw in the natural order of the world, or from the sovereignty of conscience. It was a revelation—not an hypothesis constructed by his own logical skill. He did not merely come to know that God is—that God must be. He came to know *God*, which is something infinitely different and infinitely

greater. God spoke to Abraham: that is the simplest way of putting it, and it is the truest. As *we* make ourselves known to other men by speaking to them, so, in some wonderful way of speaking, God made Himself known to Abraham; and Abraham knew that it was God Himself who was speaking.

Now we have reached the historic—earthly—beginning of the immense monotheistic religions which have had so great an effect on the religious life of mankind and on the fortunes of great nations. Abraham had faith in the God who spoke to him—believed that He was the Highest, Greatest, Best—submitted without reserve to His authority, and consequently relied upon Him for protection and blessing. Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism—the three great monotheistic faiths—all do honour to Abraham as the father of the faithful. And wherever, I repeat, there is faith in one living God—wherever that faith is a real religious force, not merely a philosophical speculation—it came from Abraham.

What then was Abraham's faith? Are we to suppose that at once, and as soon as the revelation of God came to him, he lost all belief in the existence of the gods that his fathers had worshipped? I very much doubt whether that supposition can be sustained by the Jewish Scriptures. Nor does it seem to me that to effect so sudden and complete a transition from Polytheism to Monotheism would be in harmony with what appears to be God's method of training man to the knowledge and love of Himself. There are many indications in Jewish history that for a long time some kind of belief in the existence and in the power of the gods of the nations remained side by side with a genuine love and fear of Jehovah. Jehovah was to the Jew a great King above all gods; but the other gods were regarded as something more than the creations of ignorance and superstition. God was supreme; but the shadowy forms of

inferior divinities had not wholly passed away from the heaven of Jewish thought. In the time of the prophets a farther step was made: God was not only supreme—He was alone; the gods of the nations were idols—unreal things—vanities; and those who had any reverence for them, any trust in them, are mocked at; but it was only by slow degrees that the Jews seem to have reached what I may call this absolute theoretical Monotheism.

But practically they were monotheistic from the beginning. For there was always one great religious difference between the Jews and other races. I mean, of course, between the Jews who were true to the faith of Judaism and other races. Other races not only believed that there were many gods, but worshipped them. They thought that one god was the special protection of one country, or city, or household, and another god of another. They thought that one god was supreme on the sea, and another on the land; and, therefore, they looked to different gods for help in different places and different circumstances. But to the Jew, even during those early ages, in which (shall I say?) his imagination was unable to dislodge the forms of the divinities of the heathen—to the Jew, God was the Most High—the Almighty Creator of the heavens as well as the earth, of the land as well as the sea, of the darkness as well as the light; and he worshipped no other god. To worship another god was to the true Jew, from the very first, the great, the most awful sin. That other gods might exist, was possible; they might have large powers: but they were as nothing to the Supreme; they must never receive any worship. To offer at their altars, to enter their temples, to show them any sign of reverence, was for the Jew the most appalling wickedness; other nations were also guilty, in his judgment, of a tremendous crime in worshipping them. But a god who is not worshipped—whom it is a crime to worship—is no god at all. Whatever beliefs the Jews may

have had for many generations about the existence of Baal and Ashtaroth and the rest of the gods whom their neighbours were worshipping, the true Jew was always a monotheist ; there was no power in the heavens above or on the earth beneath which could claim to share his worship : it was his distinction and glory to know and to serve the only true God. And so, for anything I can tell, Abraham himself may, for a time, or even throughout his life, have been so far under the control of the common beliefs of his contemporaries as to suppose that the gods of his fathers had real existence and real power. But he had heard the voice of a God of a wholly different kind—of a God who alone had a right to be worshipped—the Almighty God, the Just God, the Eternal God ; a God whose majesty filled him with wonder, whose righteousness filled him with awe, and in whose love for himself he had immeasurable confidence. Morally, religiously, he was a Monotheist. For him there was practically but one God ; and whatever inferior powers might have drawn to themselves the worship of mankind, the God whom he worshipped was the supreme God, and He alone had a right to sovereignty over the life and conduct of mankind. The Jews were ultimately led to theoretical truth by the path of obedience : those who were faithful to the light which had come to their race worshipped one God and only one—regarded it as a crime to worship any other, and at last they came to see that there was really no other god to worship.

Do you think that this theory of the possible imperfection of Abraham's knowledge lessens the greatness of his faith ? To me it rather seems to make his faith more energetic, more daring, more sublime. If there still remained in him the belief that the gods of the surrounding nations had real existence, with large powers to help those who served them and to injure those who refused them service, there was all the more courage, audacity, faith in

his high resolve to be loyal to the supreme God—the true God—to make no terms with the divinities which had usurped an authority to which they had no right—not to purchase their favour or avert their anger by offering any sacrifice or doing them any honour. And further, it is clear that if the shadows of common beliefs still fell upon him, and the gods of the nations still seemed to have a real though limited control over human affairs, his refusal to serve them implies a transcendent conception of the majesty of the Eternal and a profound sense of the exclusive moral right of the Eternal to his obedience and trust.

But Abraham's faith included very much more than a conviction of the supreme greatness and majesty of God, and His exclusive right to worship and obedience. Abraham's faith was a real religion, and religion includes other elements of immense importance.

Religion—true religion—what is it? What does it include? It includes a deep, immovable belief in the august greatness and glory of the living and true God, in His perfection—His moral perfection—as well as in His wisdom, His power and His eternal existence.

Yes; but that is not enough. What else?

It also includes a profound reverence and awe of God. The belief in His august greatness must be something more than belief. It must pass into emotion. The great and awful aspects of the physical universe fill us with wonder and awe. God, who is supremely great in the moral universe, should also fill us with wonder and awe; and all that is fair and beautiful in His infinite life should inspire us with delight, as all that is fair and beautiful in earth and sky inspires us with delight.

But is this all? Ah, no. As yet we have only the beginnings of what can be really called religion. There are some—there are many, I fear, who go no farther. God is a vision of glory to them, nothing more. When the vision

comes, they welcome it, as they welcome the chances of seeing a gorgeous sunset, or the immense and awful solitudes of the snow mountains. They are conscious that the vision of sublimity, greatness, beauty of a lofty kind, whether physical or moral, has an elevating power over thought and feeling, and increases at once the vigour and refinement of their own emotional and intellectual nature. True. But as yet we have nothing that can be called religion. We are in the region of æsthetics, and religion is something greater than this.

Shall we add the expression of our emotions in adoration, in song? Yes, but the real worth of the expression must depend on what is expressed; and if the emotion is æsthetic only, not religious, the expression of it is æsthetic only, not religious.

What more shall we add? In Abraham's case there was obedience to the Divine will—obedience of a very practical kind. He left the country where he had lived from his childhood, broke with the people of his own race, and went into another land and lived among strange people. He did not merely look to God to help him to fulfil his own ideas of right. He found in God a real Authority, an Authority not to be questioned,—to be submitted to and unreservedly obeyed. I shall have something to say in another paper about the offering of Isaac, but I refer to it now as the actual proof of Abraham's belief in the sovereignty of God; when he believed that God required him to sacrifice his son, he proceeded to do it. This, too, is an element of his religion,—the practical recognition in common life of God's absolute authority over us.

But is this all? Is there in religion nothing *beyond* the belief in God's greatness and perfection, reverence for Him, worship, the acknowledgment—the practical acknowledgment—of God's sovereignty by obedience? I think there is.

To Abraham God gave the great promise that in him and

his seed all nations should be blessed. Abraham believed it, and we can well imagine that this mysterious, this immense blessing, filled his thought, and that his life was lived very largely in the future which was to witness the fulfilment of the promise. And in all real religion there will be the hope and the expectation of receiving something from God. I mean that we must confidently rely on Him to do something, and to do something great for us.

It is my impression that it is at this point that the religion of many of us is wanting.

We *believe* in the majesty and glory of God, and sometimes we are profoundly moved by our thoughts of His greatness—by what seems more than our own thoughts, by the actual apprehension and vision of His greatness. Yes, and similar emotion is produced by the mountains and the sea. But the mountains and the sea do not consciously and of purpose serve us; they are but wonderful visions. Between them and us there are no free mutual relations of affection and sympathy. They are remote, they belong to another order of being. And it is possible for us to be similarly and even more deeply impressed by the greatness and glory of God, and for God to be still remote, for no friendly relations to exist between Him and us.

But as soon as we discover that there are things which He will do for us—good things, great things, and we look to Him to do them; our whole relationship to God is changed; we have really a religion. Then we each stand related to Him as person to person. He is not merely a vision of wonder, glorious, fair, but remote. He is not merely an august authority, great, mighty, but remote, binding us by His laws, Himself remaining unbound. He too is bound to *us* as we are bound to Him. There are ties on both sides. We have, I repeat, a real religion; a religion that will be the support of righteousness and a perfect solace and joy.

R. W. DALE.

DAVID'S SON AND DAVID'S LORD.

(MARK XII. 35-37.)

THE series of questions put to Jesus by His adversaries is closed by one in which He turns and silences them. In Mark it is represented as His answer : to whom or to what is not defined. It was a question evoked by the circumstances in which He found Himself ; it was His reply to them, and to the persons with whom they had confronted Him. It is addressed not so much to those who had questioned Him as to the people in general ; it is an appeal, so to speak, to the people, by way of exhibiting the theological incompetence of the scribes. In Matthew, on the other hand, it is directly addressed to the Pharisees. He asked them, What think ye concerning the Christ ? Whose son is He ? and it was when they answered, David's, that He proceeded, How then does David in spirit call Him Lord ? With their reverence for scripture and prophecy they ought to have been prepared with a solution for this problem ; and their inability to answer showed the people, who listened with delight, how little ground His adversaries had for assuming an attitude of superiority to Jesus.

But merely to foil His adversaries cannot have been the whole purpose of Jesus. The words He quotes from the 110th Psalm came to have an extraordinary importance in the Christian Church. They are more frequently quoted in the New Testament than any other scripture, and they furnish the regular description of our Lord's exaltation. They are evidently meant to suggest something very significant about the Christ : what is this, and how is it related to the opinion of the scribes ? To answer the question it is necessary to go back to the psalm.

The traditional interpretation and application of it is well known. The Davidic authorship is assumed (as in the

title), and the psalm becomes purely prophetic. "When king David thus spoke, he had been anticipatively rapt into the far future, where he saw scenes and heard words, which would no doubt occupy him long in 'searching what and what manner of time,' and what and what manner of event, 'the Spirit of Christ, which was in Him, did signify' (1 Pet. i. 11). He was gazing, though most likely he knew it not, on a scene that was consequent on the death, burial, and resurrection of his illustrious Descendant. The scene is laid in heaven; and its chronology, when sacred history holds up its torch that we may see, is coincident with the triumphal ascension of our Lord. While David gazed on the Royal Personage whom Jehovah welcomed to His side, he forgot his own little royalty, and spoke as the humblest seer that ever lived might have spoken, 'Jehovah said to my Lord.'"¹ It is generally recognised now that a view so purely supernatural as this, so unhistorical, so wanting in any intelligible connexion with experience, cannot be received. A prophet's visions of the future are not like magic lantern slides, in which anything may appear, with or without relations to reality. A more scientific reading of the psalm yields more solid and not less inspiring results.

The title, to begin with, falls away. The Psalmist hears an oracle of Jehovah addressed to his lord, *i.e.* to the king of Israel. The king, therefore, as in many other psalms, is not the author, but the subject; it is not a Psalm of David. The oracle addressed to the king is, Sit on My right hand; in other words, Share My Divine sovereignty. According to Old Testament ideas, this language is not extravagant or fantastic. The king of Israel was God's king (Ps. ii. 6); both Saul and David are called "the Lord's Anointed" (LXX. *χριστὸς κυρίου*, 1 Sam. xxiv. 10; 2 Sam. xix. 21); the book that told the story of Israel's wars was

¹ Morison on Mark *ad loc.*

"the book of the wars of Jehovah" (Num. xxi. 14). The king is assured of Divine help, and of the loyalty of his people. The Lord will send the sceptre of His might from Zion, that He may rule in the midst of His enemies; and in the day when He musters His armies in holy garments (or, as Jerome has it, on the holy mountains), a multitude will present themselves to Him, innumerable as the morning dew-drops, and all in the freshness of youth. This is the first part of the psalm, and might have been written with any pious and popular king in view, David, Jehoshaphat, or their latest successor.

It is followed by a striking sentence which, like "Sit at My right hand," came to have an extraordinary significance under the New Testament. "The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchizedek." This might almost be described as the text of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In that epistle, as Prof. Davidson shows, a priest for ever, and a priest after the order of Melchizedek, are probably synonymous terms; what the apostolic writer is interested in is the inviolable and intransmissible priesthood of Jesus. But in the Psalm a priest after the order of Melchizedek must rather be one whose priestly is combined with royal dignity; the person addressed is for ever a king and a priest in one. But is there any person in Israelitish history to whom such words can be applied? Is there any instance of the combination of kingly and priestly honours in the same individual? Such a combination is not recognised in David, nor indeed in any pre-exilic king; it can only be found in some one who, as in the Asmonæan days, was at once high priest and ruler of the State. And this may be fairly described as the prevailing opinion of scholars. It is not refuted by the ascription of perpetuity (a priest for ever) to the dignity in question. Not to mention passages like 1 Kings i. 31, Nehemiah ii. 3, there is a striking illustrative parallel in

1 Maccabees xiv. 41: "Also the Jews and priests were well pleased that Simon should be their governor and high priest for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet." Some person in Simon's position is the natural subject and starting-point of the psalm, which closes with a description of the Priest-King's victories in war.

Such is the modern—it is not too much to say the scientific—interpretation of the psalm. It is not written by David, nor about David. It is the work of an unknown poet, in a much later time; and it celebrates one who was at once the King and the High Priest of Israel, the darling and the hope of his people. But the original application has been lost; we do not know, and the Jews in the time of the gospel did not know, what historical person was before the writer's mind. Accordingly, the psalm was generalized and idealized; it was read as applying to God's King, the embodiment of the hope of Israel; that is, it was treated as Messianic. That this is legitimate will not be questioned except by those who deny that there is a Divine ideal exhibited in the union of kingship and priesthood in one person. When Jesus says that "David" calls this ideal King "Lord," he takes the title of the psalm simply as it stands. When He says that David calls Him Lord "in the spirit," He asserts that the psalm is really a piece of revelation; He gives His own word for it that there is a Divine ideal, a Divine promise, embodied in it. A Messiah, therefore, must come, and a Messiah greater than David—that is as plain as scripture can make it: whence then (this is the problem for Jesus' adversaries) whence is the Messiah David's *son*? Why, our Lord asks, is the title Son of David given by the scribes as a sufficiently characteristic designation of the Messiah, when the main thing (on David's own showing) is that the Messiah is something far higher than David, viz., David's and Israel's Lord?

Even yet one can hardly pass over the question supposed

to be at issue between Jesus and the critics as to the authorship of the psalm. That He believed the psalm to be written by David I should think it impossible for any fair-minded reader to doubt: He lived in a world where there were not two opinions about the matter, and it is hardly exaggerating to say that it was part of His true humanity that He should think on such questions as others in His situation naturally thought. But what He is engaged in teaching here—and it is for this only that we can claim His authority—is not the authorship of the psalm, but the greatness of the Messiah. This is exhibited in the psalm, undoubtedly, and the scribes who acknowledged the psalm to be a Divine revelation to David should have been the first to see it: but Jesus was inwardly and independently conscious of His Messiahship, and of His greatness in the Messianic character; and nothing turned for Him—or turns for us—on having that greatness confessed in anticipation by David. He knew that He was greater than Solomon, greater than Jonah, greater than the temple, and greater than David too: and He remains greater, though He shared the opinion of His contemporaries as to the authorship of the 110th Psalm, and used it to bring His greatness into relief for them. Nothing whatever, for His greatness, depends upon the authorship; and it is almost as wicked as it is misjudged to say, as a well-known preacher has said, that “Christ ceases to be an authority at all if David did not write this psalm.” Christ is a supreme authority, indeed, the only authority, about Himself, let us think of the psalm as we may; His witness to the truth, however, is not of the nature of miscellaneous information: it is gathered up in this one word—*I am the truth*. And here it is to His true Messianic dignity, so overlooked and misconceived among the Jews, though so obvious in Scripture, and so present to His own mind, that He directs attention.

A more serious question is raised by those who would argue that Jesus here repudiates Davidic descent. David himself, so the argument runs, calls him Lord, and that too under Divine inspiration. Lord, therefore, He must be ; but how can He then be son ? The son can never be lord of the founder of the family ; the latter must retain the supreme dignity. To be David's Lord, as the psalm requires, the Messiah must *not* be his son. This argument, I should say, is too simple, and in face of the Old Testament and the New alike proves too much. Prophecy attaches the Messianic promises to the house of David, and as Canon Gore writes in his *Dissertations*, "it is certain that the claim of Jesus to be of the royal house was acknowledged at the time and by the later Jews" (p. 38). It was certainly part of the apostolic gospel (Rom. i. 3 ; Heb. vii. 14 ; Rev. xxii. 16 ; 2 Tim. ii. 8), and it is difficult to believe that it can have become so if an express protest against it had stood in a part of our Lord's teaching which found place in all the synoptic Gospels. To deny it would not have been in the least to instruct the scribes : it would only have contradicted a constant element in the Old Testament promise, just as its denial now contradicts the passages quoted above, and some others, in the New Testament fulfilment. But if the question of Jesus does not deny the Davidic sonship, it is certainly meant to lessen the significance ascribed to it by the Jews. They spoke of it as if it were the great and essential characteristic of the Messiah : Jesus brings into relief a characteristic of the Messiah which is infinitely more significant, and makes us feel that in comparison with it the Davidic descent is as nothing. Not that it is not real, but that side by side with something else it is quite overshadowed, and hardly counts.

The form of the narrative in Matthew brings this out most clearly. Practically the question at issue is, How is the Messiah to be identified ? The scribes identify Him in

one way : they say He is David's Son. Jesus identifies Him in another way : He is David's Lord. And He appeals to the 110th Psalm to support His method of identification, and to convince the scribes that on their own principles there is at least a problem before them. It is not necessary to assume with the critics alluded to in the last paragraph, that it is an insoluble problem, and that Jesus bids us choose sonship *or* lordship as the criterion of the Messiah ; but at any rate it is a real problem, and possibly everything will be done if we can discover the value of the terms.

The scribes, then, put in the forefront of their Messianic conception the Davidic sonship. The Messiah must be a descendant of the great king, who remained, more than any other, the ideal hero of the nation. Perhaps we ought not to lay too much stress on the purely genealogical side of this. "Jewish ideas of genealogy were largely *putative*." The genealogies of Jesus in Matthew and Luke no doubt satisfied those who drew them up as proofs of the Davidic descent of our Lord : yet there are points at which every modern reader feels them artificial or obscure. If the scribes had been satisfied with the Messianic pretensions of Jesus upon other grounds, it is not likely they would have found difficulties in His family tree. Hence it is probable that in Davidic sonship they included not only a genealogical but a political filiation ; the Messiah would be found in one who revived the traditional glories of the Davidic sovereignty, and in that way received an outward historical legitimation. If this were by long association part of the meaning of "David's Son," we do not wonder at our Lord using a form of argument which suggests, at a hasty glance, that the Messiah could not be the Son of David at all.

In His own consciousness, on the other hand, Messiahship rested not upon Davidic, but upon Divine sonship. Its basis was that greatness which He felt in Himself, and which He saw in the psalm. We have hardly grounds to

go upon in the passage if we try to describe this Divine sonship more closely. We cannot say that it involved a consciousness of pre-existence, such as we find in John viii. 58, xvii. 5. As little can we say that it involved a consciousness of the supernatural birth. Perhaps we should rather be justified in assuming that Jesus had present to His mind, as He spoke, His coming exaltation to God's right hand. This is what the psalm directly suggests; this is what it is constantly used by the apostles to describe; and we know that our Lord, whose death was at hand, habitually thought and spoke of His death and His exaltation together. But it is difficult to see how this could be brought in any way into an argument with the Pharisees, or an appeal to the people. I should rather think that what the passage as a whole invites us to say is no more than this: that Divine sonship was incomparably more to Jesus than Davidic. He does not deny the latter; but it was far nearer to His soul, and far more to it, that God was His Father, and had anointed Him to be Lord of all, than that David was His remote ancestor, and He Himself David's legitimate heir. The Davidic descent undoubtedly had its value, though it may not be easy for us to appreciate it, as it is not easy for us to appreciate anything historical which lies out of our own sphere. We can understand that His birth was no chance, but determined by prophecy and by providence; and that in consequence of its taking place in that particular line He inherited the highest traditions of Israel more completely than if He had sprung from another family; but after all that is little. It was the Divine sonship which was the immediate and decisive certainty to Him, which assured His greatness, and determined the nature of His Messiahship and His kingdom. Jesus disparages the Davidic descent that He may lift the minds of the people to His unique relation to God: the main thing for Him and for us lies here. To be descended

from David is nothing; it is everything to have all things delivered to Him by the Father (Matt. xi. 27), to sit on God's right hand (Mark xvi. 19), to have all power given to Him in heaven and on earth (Matt. xxviii. 18). All this constituted the Messianic consciousness in Jesus, and if it was hid from the wise and prudent, it was revealed to babes.

What we ought to find, therefore, in this passage is a warning. We must not seek to identify the Christ in wrong or inappropriate ways. He must have marks to lead us to Him; but it is possible to be mistaken about the marks, and to refuse Him because He does not satisfy conditions that are really unconnected with His vocation. It would be a mistake of this kind if we were to say, "Jesus cannot be the Christ, He cannot be the Hope and Saviour of men, He cannot be any kind of authority at all, if He believed that David wrote the 110th Psalm while the fact is not so." It ought to be apparent to every one that this particular species of infallibility is quite irrelevant to the vocation of the Christ, and that to demand it from One who claims to be the Saviour of the world is to show that we have no sense of His real greatness. The credentials of the Christ are of quite another kind, and it is more than a pity if we are blinded to them—as the scribes were blinded to the truth as it was in Jesus—by traditional prejudices of this sort.

Positively we may say that our Lord teaches here that He is to be identified not so much by historical as by spiritual marks. Granted that He is the Son of David: still, that does not carry us very far. It does not carry us so far as to call forth faith in Him as our Saviour. We know very little of Jesus if we only know that He is the descendant and heir of David: it is a higher sonship than that—a unique relation to God—which makes Him the Messiah. The Fourth Gospel abounds in illustrations of this:

indeed we may almost say that it is a constant part of our Lord's teaching there. The Jews are about Him, eagerly discussing His claims, demanding His credentials, trying Him by all the notes or marks of Messiahship in their minds. In one place we find the Davidic descent made the test. "Some said, This is the Christ. But others said, What, doth the Christ come out of Galilee? Hath not the Scripture said that the Christ cometh of the seed of David, and from Bethlehem, the village where David was? So there arose a division in the multitude because of Him." The division was inevitable. The certitude of faith is not to be obtained by investigating the genealogy of Jesus. On another occasion the criterion of Messiahship is found in the miracles. "When Christ cometh, will He do more miracles than these which this man hath done?" There is a certain relevance in this; when we consider the character of the miracles, or signs as John calls them, they can fairly be described as "the works of the Christ" (Matt. xi. 2), and used to identify Him. Our Lord Himself used them thus when He said to the Baptist's disciples, Go and tell John the things which ye do hear and see; and to a sceptical audience elsewhere, Believe Me for the very works' sake. But this is not the prevailing mode in which He presents Himself to men. He never enters on the subject of credentials, historical or other, unprovoked. He stands before men, all through the Fourth Gospel, presenting Himself in characters which either bring their own evidence with them, or have no evidence at all. He does not say, "I am the son of David," "I was born in Bethlehem," or anything which needs external proof, but "I am the bread of life, I am the living water, I am the light of the world, I am the way, the truth, and the life." We *know* what bread and water and light are; they need no certificate or attestation; and if the Person who so speaks is bread and water and light to our souls—which is a thing for experi-

ence, not argument, to decide—then we have the highest possible evidence that He is the Christ of God, the Saviour of men.

The 110th Psalm shows the two great characters in which Jesus appears to us, and it is as we recognise the one or the other that we come to believe in Him as the Christ. One is the royal : Jesus shows that He is the Christ by His power of winning an ascendancy over men. He was born with this power in Him, and no doubt it was to this that the tempter made his appeal when he showed Him a short cut to sovereignty. Of course others have had this power too, and some in an almost incredible degree. But the born rulers of men, from the first Cæsar to the first Napoleon, ran no risk of being taken for Messiahs ; there is too much in the use of their superiority which is demonic rather than Divine. But it is a real mark of the Messiahship of Jesus, and one by which He may be properly identified as God's King, that He has this power of winning ascendancy, moral, perpetual, and universal, and that He uses it in pure love and holiness as the Redeemer of men. No one knows Him as Lord who has not found out this ; and without this, no creed is worth anything, however true, and no doctrine of His nature or endowments, however high. We know who Jesus is, and whose son He is, only when His life has created a new moral standard for us, and when, exalted at God's right hand, He is sovereign in our souls.

And we may say as much of the other character in which He appears in the prophetic psalm—the priestly. It is true that Jesus never calls Himself, nor any other, by this name ; but the ideal of the Psalm is accepted by Him, as it is in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the essential function of priesthood is claimed when He says, "I am the way . . . no man cometh unto the Father but by Me." This then, is another real mark of the Messiah, spiritual, too, and not historical, that He brings us to God. The

sinful man with whom Jesus has prevailed to arise, and trusting in His love, His atonement, His intercession, to go to the Father, does not need to ask any question as to who Jesus is. Like the Samaritans among whom our Lord once stayed, he knows that this is in truth the Saviour of the world.

These are the grounds of certainty, and the modes of knowing the Christ, which should always keep the main place in our minds. We are too ready to let questions of quite inferior consequence, often of no consequence at all, thrust them aside. In a hundred forms we let difficulties about the Davidic sonship blind us to the Divine. But the great thing is first, simplest, easiest. We may never know that Jesus was the Son of David at all; we can only know that He was believed to be so by persons who were interested in Him, and had the ordinary evidence of such facts accessible to them. But we can experience in our own souls that He is a Priest and a King, that He brings the sinful to God, and establishes His own ascendancy over them. And these are the only infallible signs of the Lord's Anointed.

JAMES DENNEY.

THE SIXTH HOUR.

IN the EXPOSITOR, vol. vii., pp. 216-223 (fourth series), it is argued that there is no justification for the theory frequently advanced¹ that the ancients reckoned the hours of the day in two ways: (1) beginning from sunrise, (2) beginning from midnight. The few reasons that have been advanced in favour of the existence of a second method of counting the hours, beginning from midnight, are there shown to possess no value, and to rest mainly on a confusion between the Roman civil Day, which was reckoned from midnight to midnight, and the popular day, in the sense of the period of light (as distinguished and separate from the period of night and darkness), which was divided into twelve hours. As the point is an interesting and important one in the comparative study of the Gospels, it seems worth while to add some further arguments, which point to the same conclusion.

(1) It has been supposed by some scholars that John in this case employed a mode of reckoning the hours from midnight current on the coast of Asia Minor, having become familiar with it during his residence in Ephesus, whereas Mark used the ordinary reckoning current elsewhere. In the article already referred to the chief example of this supposed Asia Minor reckoning (the martyrdom of Polycarp) is proved to tell strongly in favour of the ordinary reckoning from sunrise. Further, Unger, in two elaborate articles on the "Beginning of the Day,"² argues that there was a Macedonian method of reckoning even the civil

¹ To reconcile John xix. 14 with Mark xv. 25 it has been often asserted that the "sixth hour" of the former was about 6 a.m., while the "third hour" of the latter was about 9 a.m.

² *Tagesanfang*, in *Philologus*, 1892, pp. 14 ff., 212 ff.

twenty-four hours Day from sunrise to sunrise, and that this method was used in Pergamos and wherever the Macedonian calendar prevailed (*i.e.* widely in the western parts of Asia Minor). If Unger is right, it is clear that no system of hours starting from midnight was current in those parts of Asia Minor. If, on the other hand, the facts to which he appeals merely show (as I incline to think) that the universal popular conception of the day as beginning with daylight¹ tended to affect even the conception of the civil Day, it is equally made clear that in the popular conception the numbering of hours began invariably from daybreak or sunrise.

(2) Other scholars have supposed that the Roman civil Day was sometimes reckoned by hours, which, as they infer, must have started from midnight (when the civil Day began). Not merely, as was already pointed, are they unable to quote any case where the Roman hours are reckoned from midnight. Even when a Roman was describing a civil Day, or series of civil Days, he still counted his "first hour" as beginning from sunrise; and he called midnight, which was the beginning of his twenty-four hours day, "the sixth hour of the night."² Such language is plainly inconsistent with the idea that the beginning of the civil twenty-four hours Day was used as a starting-point for counting the hours.

(3) Nor can any Greek idea with regard to the Day be appealed to as supporting a reckoning from midnight. Unger shows conclusively that the Greek civil Day began

¹ It is clear that in the rough popular sense day began with the appearance of light (Unger, *l.c.*, p. 15); but the hours rigidly reckoned began from sunrise, the "first hour" being one hour after sunrise.

² See *e.g.* Ulpian (quoted in *Digest* XLI. 3, 7) *qui horâ VI diei Kal. Ian. possidere coepit, horâ sextâ noctis pridie Kal. Ian. implet usucapionem*. Here the subject is the lapse of so many civil Days, but mid-day (*plena sexta*) is called *hora VI diei*, and midnight is *hora sexta noctis*; yet the whole point lies in the fact that *hora sexta noctis* is the end of the Day and beginning of a new Day. Cp. also *Digest* XL. 1, 1; XXVIII. 1, 5. (See Unger *l.c.*)

from sunset (like the Hebrew Day and the Ecclesiastical Day).¹

Whatever be the solution of the discrepancy between the Second and the Fourth Gospel, it cannot be reasonably maintained any longer that different reckonings were employed in them. No modern scholar who investigates the subject apart from the passage in St. John finds any evidence to suggest such a view. All are clear that the hours were reckoned in one way alone. For my own part, Turkish experience is still so strong in me that I cannot feel anything serious in such difference of estimate between witnesses who naturally would be thinking little about the hour. The numerous incidents that occurred on that morning (especially according to Luke) make it probable that John's estimate is nearer the truth than Mark's.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ The view of Bilfinger is still more thoroughly opposed to the theory against which I am arguing. He maintains that both Greeks and Romans (except in Roman legal matters) reckoned the civil Day from sunrise (or sometimes in popular rough fashion, from dawn of light). See his treatise *Der bürgerliche Tag*. Unger, however, has conclusively refuted his arguments.

SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION. — The discussion of the relation of the Synoptic Gospels to one another and the argument in favour of their origin in oral tradition are reinforced by the Rev. Arthur Wright's *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek* (Macmillan & Co.). The volume is intended to assist students in the critical study of the Gospels, and it comprises six divisions. In the first of these he prints the Gospel of St. Mark, as the oldest source and historical framework of the synoptists; and alongside of Mark's narrative we have the corresponding portions of the other two Gospels. This occupies 99 large quarto pages. In the second division are printed 36 discourses from St. Matthew's Gospel with corresponding passages from Mark and Luke. The third division contains the 19 discourses peculiar to Luke. In the fourth we have 134 fragments peculiar to Matthew and Luke, either separately or in combination. The fifth consists of 16 *historical* narratives peculiar to Luke, while the sixth exhibits the editorial notes found in the Gospels. This mere enumeration is sufficient to prove the value of Mr. Wright's work. It forms an excellent supplement to Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, and serves many purposes which that useful and beautiful volume does not serve, especially presenting classifications which the *Synopticon* leaves the student to arrange for himself. Mr. Wright's volume is rather bulky for class-room work, although it is difficult to see how it could have been smaller. Certainly the Greek type is sufficiently small. The value of the book is greatly augmented by the parallels given at the foot of each page from other portions of the New Testament and from the Septuagint. As to Mr. Wright's critical conclusions, these are doubtful. The canon with which he starts and of which he makes liberal use is this: "It is reasonable to suppose that any one who undertook to write a Life of Christ would endeavour to put into it either all that he knew and could collect from trustworthy sources or else all that was current in the Church for which he wrote." But this is precisely what all recent criticism has tended to disprove, and certainly such a canon is shattered if applied to the Fourth Gospel. But as providing the student with the text of the Gospels in a form which saves a vast amount of

labour and greatly facilitates critical investigation, Mr. Wright's book is to be most cordially and unreservedly recommended. There is little doubt that having the material in this shape many will take heart to examine the problems. The greatest care has been spent upon the work, and many little contrivances for facilitating study show the editor's appreciation of the real wants of the student, and that he has spared no pains in supplying them. The hints in the preface for a plan of study are evidently those of the practical teacher.

Another important contribution to the solution of the synoptic problem is made by Mr. J. Fulton Blair, B.D., in his *Apostolic Gospel* (Smith, Elder & Co.). Mr. Blair possesses ample knowledge, much general ability, and a pronounced faculty for criticism. His Introduction, in which he explains and advocates his own theory, might have been more lucid, but there is no question of the skill and force with which he establishes his view. Briefly stated, that view is that our Gospels, including the Fourth, may be traced not to two sources, as recent critics uniformly maintain, but to one. The Second Gospel is not a reproduction of the preaching of Peter, but merely a combination of the current versions of the primitive oral gospel. "The apostolic source, which existed at first as an oral tradition, was committed to writing, at different places by different men, to meet the requirements of the Christian society," and Mark is a combination or harmony of these versions. The Fourth Gospel is an elaborated version of the apostolic source. The Gospels of Matthew and Luke are also reproductions of the same source. Of course in twenty pages, which are all he allows himself for the exposition of his theory, he cannot answer the questions one would naturally ask, nor reply to the obvious difficulties of his position. He trusts, presumably, to the impression which may be produced by his elaborate notes on this primitive source, extending to about 300 pages and designated *A Critical Reconstruction of the Text*. He does however answer the question, "What becomes of the miracles," when the documents are analyzed? His reply is that the apostolic source "contained beyond question narratives involving miracle." But, as the apostolic source existed at first as an oral tradition, the hypothesis that the miracles were oral accretions is certainly not excluded. Mr. Blair should have added that it is the part of criticism to show whether they are

or are not accretions. Instead however of entering upon any such criticism he merely endeavours to show that, according to the evidence of the Gospels, the mythical theory is competent. In support of this statement he maintains that it was the absence of miracles which Jesus, in addressing the messengers of John, referred to as being the occasion of stumbling. This however is completely to misunderstand the passage. It was the very fact that Jesus wrought miracles and yet would not use His power to establish a visible kingdom, which was the occasion of stumbling to the Baptist. With all drawbacks, however, this is a book of considerable value, containing much which must enter into future discussions of this perplexing subject.

Those who have been using Mrs. Lewis's translation of the Syriac Gospels found in the Sinaitic Palimpsest must often have lamented the occurrence of so many lacunæ, which, in accordance with the well-known perversity of such matters, always occur precisely where one is most anxious to have information. The fact is that about one-fifth of the whole remained undeciphered by the skilled but hard-pressed transcribers of 1893. Mrs. Lewis, with the true zeal of the scholar, undertook another journey to the Convent during the spring of last year for the express purpose of completing the transcription : and in the present handsome quarto she gives to the world the result of her enterprise, industry and skill. The pages of the Syriac previously defective are now given in full and are so printed as to facilitate interleaving with the edition published in 1894. The passages and words recovered during this last visit are printed in blue. The first half of the volume is occupied with an interesting introduction and the translation. It is to be hoped this part of the volume will be re-issued in a cheap form, as there are many who wish to know what text and what interpretation are sanctioned by the Syriac, although they have no knowledge of the language. Great authority must be allowed to so primitive a version, for even though it may not represent the Syriac New Testament of the century between 70 and 170 A.D., as Mrs. Lewis not unreasonably supposes it may, yet there seems to be a consent of critics to place it not later than the middle of the second century ; or, at the outside, in the third quarter. Mrs. Lewis by this difficult piece of work has earned the gratitude of all lovers of learning, and has erected a monument *ære perennius*. The volume is issued by the Cam-

bridge University Press and is entitled *Some Pages of the Four Gospels re-transcribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest, with a translation of the Whole Text*, by Agnes Smith Lewis.

From the same press is issued the fifth number of *Studia Sinaitica*. This consists of *Apocrypha Sinaitica*, edited and translated into English by Margaret Dunlop Gibson, M.R.A.S. Seven apocryphal writings are here given both in their Arabic dress and in an English translation. They are the Anaphora Pilati (of which there is given a Syriac as well as two Arabic recensions), two recensions of the Recognitions of Clement, the Martyrdom of Clement, the Preaching of Peter, the Martyrdom of James son of Alphæus, the Preaching of Simon son of Cleophas, and the Martyrdom of Simon son of Cleophas. Some of these writings may seem silly and none of them of much intrinsic value; but they are important as helping to fill out our picture of primitive times. Of one of them Mrs. Gibson says: "It is a lively example of how mediæval monks managed to slake the universal human thirst for fiction. Probably such tales took a similar place within the cloistered fane to the modern religious novel in Puritan families; they were also quite as harmless and even more edifying." The *Sunday Magazine* and the *Quiver* must look to their laurels. As historical waymarks these Apocrypha have their value, and Baur has shown us how they may or may not be used. The editor of this scholarly volume will allow us to say how overpowering an argument for the education of women is to be found in her own labours and those of her sister; and how such productions as the *Studia Sinaitica* signalize the closing years of this century as something more than a revival of the days of great Elizabeth.

EXPOSITION.—To the International Critical Commentary (Messrs. T. & T. Clark) there has been added *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Mark*, from the pen of the Rev. Ezra P. Gould, S.T.D., Professor of New Testament language and literature, Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia. In this commentary Prof. Gould adopts the usual method of prefixing some introductory matter, but the contents of this introduction are not such as are usually found in this connection. A chapter on the Person and Principles of Jesus, another on the Gospels in the Second Century, and a third on Recent Critical Literature, form the larger part of this

introduction. The treatment of the relation of Mark to the other synoptical Gospels is slight, and the value of the chapter on the recent critical literature may be estimated from the entire absence of the names of Weizsäcker, Reuss, Pfleiderer, Klostermann, and Sanday. Prof. Gould furnishes the reader with no bibliography, nor is there in his volume any reference to the older commentators. The meanings of words are determined by an off-hand appeal to Thayer. This leaves an impression of slightness, thinness, meagreness. Still there is in the volume much that is weighty and valuable. The writer carries himself with the confidence and firmness of one who can find his own way and who feels himself sufficiently equipped. And probably for those who wish conclusions and not processes there is not a better commentary on the Gospel of Mark than Prof. Gould's. Doctrinally he sometimes betrays the half-heartedness so characteristic of our age (p. 181, 202, etc.). Critically he conserves what is important, and exhibits in non-essentials a freedom which is gratifying in an American. In his remarks upon the language he is frequently insufficient and sometimes wrong. As examples of insufficiency may be cited his treatment of the words used to describe the attitude of Herod, and of Herodias towards the Baptist (p. 112), where a reference to Field's *Otium Norvicense* would have saved him; or his explanation of the camel and the needle's eye (194); or his statement about καὶ εἰ and εἰ καί, which indeed is misleading. As instances of error may be cited his statement that εἰ is never used in classical Greek in direct questions; (for the establishment of the classical use, though rare, see Hoogeveen;); his finding fault, on two separate occasions, with the English versions' rendering of ἐξέβαλεν as not being sufficiently forcible; (if he will consult John x. 4 and several common expressions in classical Greek, he will see that the verb in question does by no means invariably imply force;); and his finding in κατέκειτο the note of prostration (p. 25), although [it is the word used of reclining at table. He also accuses Mark of barbarism (p. 88) when following the ordinary Greek usage regarding negatives; and one would suppose from some of his translations (p. 222) that he is under the impression that the Greek aorist ought never or rarely to be translated by the English perfect. American spelling should also have been avoided; "apothegm" cannot look right on any continent; and even to a demoniac Jesus cannot be conceived as saying "Shut up." The English is printed in a good

clear type (three misprints, pp. 82, 131, 177); the Hebrew also is firm and well set up (misprint on p. 98); but throughout the volume something has happened to the Greek "iotas" and "nus," which are either from a wrong fount or badly set. A much better type was used for the Meyer series. Misprints in the Greek occur on pp. 101, 108, 176, 233, 238, but these are slight and of no consequence at all. These blemishes prevent us from accepting this as the ideal book on Mark's Gospel, but nevertheless Prof. Gould's commentary is written with ability and judgment; it contains much valuable material, and it carries the reader satisfactorily through the Gospel. Great care has been spent upon the text.

Uniformly excellent as the Cambridge Bible has been, no contributor has done it better service than Mr. Arthur Carr. His name is now a guarantee for original, scholarly, illuminating work; and to say that his contribution to the Cambridge Greek Testament on *The Epistle of St. James* is on the same level of excellence as his commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel is to give it the highest praise. Following Prof. Mayor and Beyschlag, Mr. Carr might have been expected to depend mainly on them. But Mr. Carr works with his own material, and with a judgment unbiassed. Short as the Epistle is, there are several points which test both the knowledge and the wisdom of an interpreter; and both in these testing passages and elsewhere Mr. Carr acquits himself to admiration. We can only suggest that had he read Ezra Abbot's criticism of Trench, a paragraph on p. 52 would have been deleted. Trench, with all his great merits, has introduced several errors into exegesis; and one of them is the distinction Mr. Carr here accepts. Possessing this brief commentary, one is adequately equipped, and needs no other aid for the understanding of this Epistle.

The Epistle of James and other Discourses is the title of a volume by the late Dr. Dale, of Birmingham, issued now under the editorial care of his son through Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton. Dr. Dale was a man whose strength of conviction and sanity of judgment gave him a steadily increasing influence, and during his lifetime no more characteristic utterances were given to the public than those contained in this volume. His practical sagacity and involvement in affairs furnished him as the expositor of the Epistle which views Christianity as a new enforcement of righteousness of life; and the miscellaneous discourses which form the second half

of this volume illustrate the interest he took in the vicissitudes of faith and the religious movement of his own day, and give us the benefit of the broad charity and keen wisdom with which he strove to guide the mind of his generation. There is a ring of manly sense and religious faith throughout these Discourses which is very inspiring in an age when indifference seems on the increase.

The mystery which hangs round the Book of Revelation continues to attract enterprising interpreters, and two fresh names must be added to the list of those who have essayed to pluck out its heart. *The Revelation Given to St. John the Divine* (Elliot Stock) is a painstaking and frequently suggestive volume by John H. Latham, M.A., Late Fellow of Clare College, Cambridge. Primarily it is a closely literal translation intended to bring the English reader as nearly into touch with the original as possible. Notes are added, and these are often of value, always original and illustrating the text from a considerable fund of historical and general knowledge. As a foundation for further study Mr. Latham's book will prove of service.

The Divine Parable of History, a concise exposition of the Revelation of St. John the Divine, by H. Arthur Smith, M.A., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law (Charles H. Kelly) is one of the Wesleyan "Books for Bible Students," and its title indicates the view taken of the book. It follows the line of exposition adopted by such commentators as Milligan and Vaughan, who adopted what is known as the "resumptive theory," believing that the visions and utterances were not intended to give definite anticipations of future history, but were to bring encouragement and light to each generation. Many will welcome this volume as giving them in a convenient form and in a fresh and animated style a presentation of the meaning and uses of the Book of Revelation on this principle.

Mr. A. E. Brooke, Fellow and Dean of King's College, Cambridge, has issued in two volumes a convenient and very accurately printed edition of *The Commentary of Origen on S. John's Gospel* (Cambridge University Press). This was no slight undertaking, for the text was in a bad state; and Mr. Brooke may not only be congratulated on the successful achievement of so heavy a task, but may also be complimented on the scholarship and diligence he has so liberally spent upon it. In itself the commentary cannot be praised without qualification. It is indeed, if

the truth must be told even of so great a genius, a tedious and fanciful performance, running out into unprofitable and wearisome allegorizing and subtleties, and showing little of the business-like, relevant, and acute observation of Euthymius or Theophylact. Here and there a brilliant flash relieves the tedium, but it is doubtful whether any one who wishes to understand the Gospel will find himself repaid by the labour of reading Origen's often obscure and always heavy Greek. Still, as everything written by so great a man deserves preservation, Mr. Brooke has done a public service which deserves recognition in editing this Commentary. Origen never completed it, but reached only within sight of the close of the 13th chapter; and of the thirty-two books in which he uttered himself regarding this part of the Gospel, only nine have come down to our time. These exist in nine extant MSS., of which five are derived from a MS. which lies in Venice, and is known as Codex Venetus or V; while two are derived from a MS. of the 13th century, now lodged in the Stadt-Bibliothek at Munich, and is designated M, or Codex Monacensis. The question is whether V is not itself derived from M. Mr. Brooke believes it is, and that our nine authorities are thus reduced to one. This is disputed; but if the Munich Codex is really of the 13th century, prior in date to the others, then the reasons adduced by Mr. Brooke for reducing V to dependence upon it seem incontrovertible. In none of the others are any of the lost books found, and the illegible parts of M are represented by gaps in the others.

Mr. T. H. Archer-Hind, M.A., has published (Elliot Stock) *Some Scripture Problems and their Solutions*. The problems are the well-worn ones of Baptism for the Dead, the Sin unto Death, Peter's Cursing and Swearing, and so forth. The solutions are Mr. Archer-Hind's own, and most certainly deserve consideration. They are both ingenious and scholarly.

NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. — A notable contribution to New Testament Theology has been made by Prof. Salmond in his *Christian Doctrine of Immortality* (T. & T. Clark). Less need here be said of this book because already it has secured a firm place in public favour, and it has qualities which fit it to retain that place. It is a carefully considered study, first of the idea of immortality among non-Christian peoples, and then of the growth of the belief as manifested in the Old Testament and of its full

deliverance in the New. The whole is a very careful piece of work, full of the fruits of wide reading and of a mind trained in the scientific study of Scripture. The conclusions reached are in agreement with traditional ideas, but no reader is likely to suggest that Dr. Salmond is a biased and unfair interpreter. Every passage which has any bearing on the great theme is scrutinized and allowed to tell its full meaning; and although the writers of the New Testament are dealt with separately, they are all found to be unanimous on the main issues. The utmost that can be said by any adverse critic is that where so many passages are interpreted Dr. Salmond's view of each and all may not be accepted; and that where so many difficulties and objections are to be removed he may not be found to have disposed of all of them in an equally satisfactory manner. But that is merely to say that Dr. Salmond has written a large and important book. No one can doubt that this will permanently be recognised as the authoritative exposition of the doctrine of Scripture regarding immortality.

Two other books on a part of this large subject illustrate the restlessness of mind which prevails regarding it. "A Lay Churchman" (author of "The Home Prayer Book") publishes *The Faithful Dead: Shall we Pray for Them?* (James Nisbet & Co.), in which he opposes the views of Dean Luckock and Canon MacColl regarding the intermediate state and the condition of those who have departed this life, and proves that prayers for the dead are not encouraged by the Book of Common Prayer nor by Scripture. The book is brief, lucid and vigorous, and should appeal to reasonable people. Dr. Barrett, of Norwich, also publishes (Elliot Stock) *The Intermediate State and the Last Things*, in which he argues that there is an intermediate state and that in it good and evil alike grow; that prayers for the dead, when offered in secret by pious souls for those on whom their affection is fixed, need not be blamed, but that they deserve severe reprobation when they are practised as a "part of the great Catholic and sacerdotal revival that is rapidly revolutionizing the Church of England." Dr. Barrett considers with some fulness "the doom of the lost," and believes that both Scripture and reason land us in an insoluble antinomy. He is at pains to show that there are certain great truths, such as God's sovereignty and man's freedom, which must be left unreconciled. That is admitted. But Dr. Barrett should have shown that the fate of the impenitent

belongs to that class of "ultimate truths"; a task he scarcely attempts, and which, it is to be feared, he would attempt in vain. At the same time Dr. Barrett has given us a volume written in a tender and reverent spirit, with many fresh ideas on a somewhat hackneyed theme, and with some observations that deserve earnest consideration.

MISCELLANEOUS.—Among books not directly bearing upon the New Testament may be mentioned the *Outlines of Church History* by Rudolf Sohm, Professor of Law, Leipzig, translated by Miss May Sinclair, with a preface by Prof. H. M. Gwatkin, M.A. (Macmillan & Co.). This little book has run through eight editions in six years in Germany, and we shall be surprised if it does not prove as acceptable and popular in its English dress. For we have nothing to compete with it. Prof. Sohm has the gift of seeing the salient features and essential issues in each movement and of presenting the meaning and spirit of the history disentangled from the mass of facts with which it is usually overlaid. As Prof. Gwatkin says in his preface: "Short as it is, it is neither a meagre sketch nor a confused mass of facts, but a masterly outline of Church History from the first ages to our own times, combining a lawyer's precision and a historian's insight into the meaning of events with a philosopher's sense of the unity of history and a Christian's conviction that the kingdom of God is spiritual." That is high praise from one so competent to judge, but it is praise which every reader will heartily echo. It is a most delightful and instructive book.

A volume in the same department of literature, though not of the same calibre, is Dr. Marvin Vincent's *Age of Hildebrand*. This forms the fifth (but first published) of a series proposed by the Christian Literature Company of New York, and entitled "Ten Epochs of Church History." The publishers intimate that as the present volume is both larger and more handsomely bound than was contemplated in their original plan, they have found it necessary to limit the time for the acceptance of orders at one dollar a volume to May 1st, after which a dollar and a half will be the price. Dr. Vincent is better known on this side as a Bibliographer and New Testament student than as a historian, but in the present volume he certainly shows a faculty for writing interesting narrative. The idea of the series is an excellent one, and this first-published volume will recommend it to the public.

The bibliographical list, although not professing completeness, will be found most useful.

Dr. Alfred Barry has published his Hulsean Lectures under the title, *The Ecclesiastical Expansion in the Growth of the Anglican Communion*. In this volume a most interesting and informative account is given of the Church of England in the colonies and among the heathen.

The Rev. Henry Veale, of University College, Durham, has published (Elliot Stock) *The Devotions of Bishop Andrewes* (Græce et Latine), carefully edited and arranged in sectional paragraphs. No previous edition of these Devotions has been so fully furnished as this with introduction, notes, index, and even vocabulary. Mr. Veale, who tells us he is 79 years of age, has evidently spent love and labour on his edition. And it has its advantages. For one thing it can be had, which cannot be said of all the others. But a book of devotion should be handy, and Hall's edition of 1828, published by Pickering, is smaller, lighter, and more convenient. Also one is grieved to find, after all the labour its editor has spent upon it, that this edition by Mr. Veale is sorely blemished by misprints. The list of *errata* is long, but it should be very much longer. The type, however, is clear and good, and, as previous editions were by no means faultlessly printed, Mr. Veale's may be recommended. The form in which such a book should appear is exemplified in the beautiful edition of the Devotions in English, published by Messrs. Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, with Dr. Whyte's valuable biography and interpretation. This surpasses every edition for accuracy and attractiveness, but, of course, some will prefer the original.

The Ministry of the Lord Jesus, by Thomas G. Selby (Charles H. Kelly, Books for Bible Students), is one of the best volumes in an excellent series. To say that Mr. Selby himself has written nothing quite so richly suggestive, is to give it a foremost place in the religious literature of our time; yet no one who makes himself acquainted with it will pronounce this an extravagant estimate. Dealing with a subject which is not only permanently central, but has also a peculiar attractiveness at the present time, it adds greatly to our ability rightly to conceive of its essential features and guiding principles. It wholly differs from Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus* both in method and in contents; and it brings us much more penetratingly into the spirit of the Teacher than

that useful work does. It is not only that Mr. Selby writes with much greater literary force, and out of a mind filled with ideas and with imagery, but there is also discernible throughout the volume the workings of a mind that has learned truth in various ways, by spiritual struggle, by quiet contemplation, by experimental knowledge as well as by exegesis. The small size of the volume necessarily limits the number of subjects treated, and Mr. Selby has, we think, wisely chosen to deal rather with points which have been either neglected altogether, or slightly handled in other books on the subject. Thus we find the limitations and universalism of Christ's ministry very effectively exhibited; the sources of His authority, His humility, His idea of prayer, as well as His utterances regarding His death, and the future of men, are all set before us with extraordinary freshness and power.

A second and enlarged edition of Dr. John Clifford's *Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* deserves a word of welcome (James Clarke & Co.). It is one of the best books we have on the subject, and it cannot but greatly aid in diffusing much needed light on the nature and scope of the Bible.

Mr. Somervell, Assistant Master at Harrow, has arranged from Kings and Chronicles a *Parallel History of the Jewish Monarchy* (Cambridge University Press). It will not only be a most suitable text-book for schools, but will materially assist the private reader of the Bible to understand the history and the relation to one another of its two Biblical sources.

SERMONS.—To the ever-increasing accumulation of sermon-literature the most notable addition is a fresh volume of Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's *Anglican Pulpit Library*—Easter to Ascensiontide. In this volume there are even more new names than in those previously published, and the same discrimination and good taste are manifested in the selection both of sermons and of illustrations.—We have also received *The Mystery of the Cross*, eight addresses on the Atonement by the Rev. Winfrid O. Burrows, M.A. (Rivington, Percival & Co.). Principal Burrows, in his preface, speaks with regret of the "victims of Calvinistic theories of the Atonement." But this is evidently a mere fashion of speaking, for to all intents and purposes he himself holds all that is essential in the Calvinistic theory. Our Lord "approached God as our Representative, as alienated because we had alienated ourselves [few Calvinists would go so far as that], as ready to die

because we deserved to die. And so He bowed Himself to receive the chastisement of our peace." In fact, Principal Burrows gives an excellent exposition of the orthodox theory of Atonement.—From the same publishers comes a volume of *Sermons Preached in the Leeds Parish Church*, 1889–1895, by Edward, Bishop of Rochester (at that time Vicar of Leeds). These are forcible and effective.—Mr. Elliot Stock issues a volume of sermons by A. T. B., entitled *Sowing to the Spirit*; also *The Image of God*, and other sermons by Rev. J. M. Gibbon, whose name guarantees their freshness and truth to life. The same publisher sends us *Plain Talks on Plain Subjects*, by Fred A. Rees, straightforward advice interspersed with good quotations on such subjects as "Whom to Marry," "The No-mind Family," "Woman's Rights," "Jerry-building."—Messrs. John F. Shaw & Co. issue a volume of Sermons and Addresses by the Rev. H. B. Macartney, of Melbourne, entitled *For their Sakes I Sanctify Myself*.

Attention may be called to the series of "Little Books on Religion," edited by W. Robertson Nicoll, LL.D. (Hodder and Stoughton). Of these there have appeared *The Seven Words from the Cross*, by the editor; *Christ and the Future Life*, by R. W. Dale, LL.D.; *The Four Temperaments*, by Rev. Alex. Whyte, D.D.; and *The Upper Room*, by Rev. John Watson, D.D.

MARCUS DODS.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, D.D.	
The Date of the Epistle of the Gallican Churches in the Second Century	111
On Some Phrases in the Raising of Lazarus	217
Rev. Prof. A. B. Bruce, D.D.	
Jesus Mirrored in Matthew, Mark, and Luke :	
I. The Prophetic Picture of Matthew	15
II. The Realistic Picture of Mark	95
III. The Idealised Picture of Luke	200
IV. The Synagogue Ministry	295
V. The Mission to the Publicans	321
VI. Jesus Longing for True Disciples	418
Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
A Forgotten Kingdom in a Prophecy of Balaam	77
Lic. Carl Clemen, Ph.D.	
The Oldest Christian Sermon	392
F. C. Conybeare, M.A.	
An Ante-Nicene Homily of Gregory Thaumaturgus. Now first translated	161
Rev. John A. Cross, M.A.	
The Theology of the Fourth Gospel	151
Rev. R. W. Dale, D.D., LL.D.	
The Tower of Babel	1
A Spiritual House	127
"An Elect Race"	191
Christians and Social Institutions	287
Like-Minded	349
Abraham	434

	PAGE
Rev. James Denney, D.D.	
Cæsar and God	61
The Great Commandment	312
David's Son and David's Lord	445
Rev. Prof. Marcus Dods, D.D.	
Survey of Recent Biblical Literature	152, 236
Survey of Literature on the New Testament	460
Rev. Joseph Edkins, D.D.	
Officers	148
Right Rev. Charles J. Ellicott, D.D., D.C.L.	
Reminiscences of the Lectionary Committee	241
Very Rev. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.	
Professor Sayce and the Higher Criticism	30
Rev. Prof. A. F. Kirkpatrick, D.D.	
The Septuagint Version: its Bearing on the Text and Interpretation of the Old Testament	263
Rev. Hugh Macmillan, D.D., LL.D.	
Divine Evolution	367
Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.	
Basil of Cæsarea	49
The Lawful Assembly	137
St. Paul and the Jewish Christians in A.D. 46	174
A Fixed Date in the Life of St. Paul	336
The Sixth Hour	457
Rev. H. A. Redpath, D.D.	
Concordances to the Old Testament in Greek	69
A Means towards Arriving at a more Correct Hebrew Text of the Old Testament	346
Rev. Professor A. Roberts, D.D.	
Interpretation of Romans viii. 33, 34	380
Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D.	
"St. Paul the Traveller"	81
The Early Visits of St. Paul to Jerusalem	253

Rev. James Stalker, D.D.

Wendt's Untranslated Volume on the Teaching of Christ. 401

Rev. John Watson, D.D.

Jesus our Supreme Teacher 225

Rev. Prebendary Whitefoord, B.D.

The Ideal Preacher 357

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis ii. 4	39	Matthew viii. 16	24
x. 3, 4	271	ix. 1-8	24
xi. 1-9	1	x. 14	312
xii. 1-4	434	xi. 25-30	151
xlix. 19	271	xi. 25	432
Joshua xxiv. 2-15	438	xi. 28	418
2 Samuel vi. 3	271	xiii. 3	308
xxii. 11	271	xv. 17	206
2 Kings xv. 10	275	xix. 12	207
1 Chronicles xi. 29	271	xviii. 3-6	210
Psalms xviii. 11	271	xx. 20-28	205
xxxiv. 12	355	xxii. 32	302
xlii. 6, 7	271	xxiii. 8	225
cxiv. 8	312	Mark i. 12	99
Isaiah viii. 14	192	i. 21	101
ix. 11	274	i. 22	17
ix. 12	16	i. 39	295
xxxv. 2	362	i. 43	217
Jeremiah xxiii. 33	271	ii. 27	109
xxiii. 33	277	iii. 7-8	307
Hosea ii. 21	368	iii. 21	105
iv. 18	271	iii. 22	106
Malachi iii. 1	365	vi. 3	97
Matthew iii. 17	21	vi. 5	300
iv. 16	16	vi. 14	106
iv. 23	17	vii. 19	103
iv. 25	307	viii. 11-21	205
v. 21	101	x. 14	211
vii. 29	17	x. 32	108
viii. 2-4	305	x. 35	205
viii. 5-13	28	x. 45	207

	PAGE		PAGE
Mark xii. 13-17	61	Acts vi. 2.	183
xii. 28-34	312	vii. 58.	343
xii. 35	445	xi. 30.	85
Luke iii. 7-20	360	xi. 30.	92
iv. 16-30	21	xii. 12	261
iv. 22	213	xiii. 2, 3	91
iv. 31-37	305	xv. 7	91
iv. 42	103	xvi. 4	177
v. 12	208	xvii. 21	139
v. 27-32	322	xviii. 23	338
vi. 6	208	xix. 39	137
vii. 18-30	357	xx. 5.	338
vii. 36-50	25	xxiv. 10	338
vii. 36-50	212	Romans i. 3	450
viii. 25	205	viii. 33, 34	380
ix. 38	209	1 Corinthians xv. 8	423
x. 21-24	151	xv. 33	387
xi. 1.	209	Galatians i. 10	366
xvii. 5, 6	205	ii. 1-10	255
xviii. 15-17	210	ii. 1-10	175
xviii. 24	208	ii. 7-9	85
xix. 1-10	25	ii. 11-14	94
xix. 45	213	iii. 20	98
xx. 11-28	206	Hebrews iii. 4	392
xxii. 31	204	Peter ii. 3-7	287
xxiv. 25	359	ii. 5	127
xxiv. 44	265	ii. 9	191
John i. 23	365	iii. 8-12	346
iii. 30	366	Revelation xxi. 41	223
xiv. 1	220	xxii. 16.	450



X-18419

UCSB LIBRARY



A 000 456 963 8

